



Rewarding Learning

**ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education**

History

Assessment Unit A2 2

Historical Investigations and Interpretations

[AHY21]

Assessment

**MARK
SCHEME**

General Marking Instructions

Introduction

The main purpose of the mark scheme is to ensure that papers are marked accurately, consistently and fairly. The mark scheme provides teachers with an indication of the nature and range of students' responses likely to be worthy of credit. It also sets out the criteria which they should apply in allocating marks to students' responses.

Assessment objectives

Below are the assessment objectives for **GCE History**.

Students should be able to:

- 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.
- AO2** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.
- AO3** Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Quality of students' responses

In marking papers, teachers should be looking for a quality of response reflecting the level of maturity which may reasonably be expected of a 17 or 18-year-old which is the age at which the majority of candidates sit their GCE examinations.

Flexibility in marking

Mark schemes are not intended to be totally prescriptive. No mark scheme can cover all the responses which students may produce. In the event of unanticipated answers, teachers are expected to use their professional judgement to assess the validity of answers.

Positive marking

Teachers are encouraged to be positive in their marking, giving appropriate credit for what students know, understand and can do rather than penalising students for errors or omissions. Teachers should make use of the whole of the available mark range for any particular question and be prepared to award full marks for a response which is as good as might reasonably be expected of a 17 or 18-year-old GCE candidate.

Awarding zero marks

Marks should only be awarded for valid responses and no marks should be awarded for an answer which is completely incorrect or inappropriate.

Type of mark scheme

Mark schemes for questions which require students to respond in extended written form are marked on the basis of levels of response which take account of the quality of written communication.

Levels of response

In deciding which level of response to award, teachers should look for the 'best fit' bearing in mind that weakness in one area may be compensated for by strength in another. In deciding which mark within a particular level to award to any response, teachers are expected to use their professional judgement.

The following guidance is provided to assist teachers.

- **Threshold performance:** Response which just merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the bottom of the range.
- **Intermediate performance:** Response which clearly merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the middle of the range.
- **High performance:** Response which fully satisfies the level description and should be awarded a mark at or near the top of the range.

Quality of written communication

Quality of written communication is taken into account in assessing students' responses to all questions that require them to respond in extended written form. These questions are marked on the basis of levels of response. The description for each level of response includes reference to the quality of written communication.

For conciseness, quality of written communication is distinguished within levels of response as follows:

Level 1: Quality of written communication is basic.

Level 2: Quality of written communication is satisfactory.

Level 3: Quality of written communication is good.

Level 4: Quality of written communication is of a high standard.

In interpreting these level descriptions, teachers should refer to the more detailed guidance provided below:

Level 1 (Basic): The student makes only a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 (Satisfactory): The student makes a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 (Good): The student makes a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 (High Standard): The student successfully selects and uses the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

General guidance for teachers marking A2 Unit 2

1. Do not be afraid to award maximum marks at the top of Level 4 for an excellent response.
2. Reward evidence and analysis which is valid and plausible but does not appear in the mark scheme.
3. Do not let the existence of a mistake or inaccuracy prevent you from awarding the maximum mark in the appropriate level. While mistakes cannot receive any credit, the existence of an error should not prejudice you against the rest of what could be a perfectly valid answer.
4. The mark you award should be determined by the level descriptors. When you have decided which of the four levels is most appropriate for the answer, start in the middle of that level and make a judgement about whether it should remain in the middle or deserves to be placed closer to the top or bottom of the level.

Criteria for assessing answers to Q1 (a)

Students are required to assess the **value** of one source. Answers must evaluate the strengths of the content of the source and, in assessing how valuable it is, may also evaluate its weaknesses and limitations. Students **may** include reference to the author, date, motive and audience of the source but **do not expect a comprehensive evaluation of these features**. Contextual knowledge **must be included to achieve a Level 4 mark**. The mark awarded is **holistic**; there are no specific marks allocated to the above criteria.

Criteria for assessing answers to Q1 (b)

Students are required to assess how far the sources agree or disagree with the proposition. They are expected to bring in their own knowledge to support or refute the proposition. To gain credit, a student's own knowledge must relate to the wording of the question. The mark awarded is holistic, but, as a rule, the students' use of the sources and their own knowledge should receive equal weight in arriving at a mark. So, for example, a mark out of ten for use of the sources and a mark out of ten for their own knowledge.

Criteria for assessing answers to Q2

The students' responses will be assessed on the basis of four generic skills set out in the mark scheme. These are:

1. The quality of the student's understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two extracts. **What does this mean?** It means the student's ability to provide a clear and concise summary of the contrasting arguments put forward by the two historians.
2. The quality of the student's analysis and evaluation of the different interpretations. **What does this mean?** This means the student's ability to analyse and evaluate in greater depth the arguments contained in the two interpretations.
3. The quality of the student's understanding of the historical context. **What does this mean?** Students are expected to include relevant contextual knowledge in their response. 'Contextual knowledge' is evidence students bring into their answer which is not included in the interpretations but is directly related to the arguments they contain.

However, it should be stressed that students will not gain any marks for including in their answer material which is not directly related to the arguments contained in the interpretations.

4. The student's judgement about which interpretation he or she finds more convincing and the quality

of the evidence provided in support of his or her judgement. **What does this mean?** Students will be expected to evaluate how convincing they find Interpretation A and Interpretation B by using their own contextual knowledge and evidence from the interpretations to support and challenge both interpretations. Answers may challenge both interpretations but it would be important for the student to challenge the interpretation he or she finds less convincing.

The mark awarded to the answer is **holistic**. There are no specific marks allocated to these four criteria.

Level 1 responses will display **little or no** awareness of these generic skills.

Level 2 responses will display a **satisfactory** awareness of these generic skills.

Level 3 responses will display a **good** awareness of these generic skills.

Level 4 responses will display a **very good** awareness of these generic skills.

It should be stressed that many responses will be placed in different levels for the different criteria. For example, an answer may display a very good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two extracts (Level 4), a very good analysis and evaluation of the different interpretations (Level 4) and very good evidence in support of their judgement (Level 4), while showing a good awareness of the historical context (Level 3). In this instance, the teacher will adopt a 'best fit' approach and the answer would be awarded a mid-Level 4 mark.

Structure of the responses

There is no prescribed way to structure an answer to this question. Students may prefer to discuss each interpretation in turn, while others may wish to make direct contrasts between the interpretations throughout their response. Each approach is equally valid.

Answers should provide an introduction and a conclusion. In the introduction, students should clearly set out the two different interpretations and their judgement about which they find more convincing. In the conclusion, they should restate which interpretation they find more convincing and justify their judgement.

The focus of the answer should be on the historians' interpretations

Students should focus throughout the answer on justifying why they consider, for example, Interpretation A to be more convincing than Interpretation B.

Communication of ideas

Although Quality of Written Communication is not assessed in this question, students are nonetheless expected to communicate their ideas clearly and accurately. For example, the overall flow of the answer is enhanced if direct quotations from the interpretations are effectively integrated into it.

NB

Students are not required to include the views of other historians or schools of thought.

Criteria for assessing answers to Q3 (a) and Q3 (b)

This is a traditional essay question. It requires students to assess or evaluate a statement or a quotation, discussing both sides of the argument. Students are expected to support their arguments with relevant evidence and draw logical conclusions based on the evidence they have presented. Reward answers which are clearly structured. Students are required to include an introduction and a conclusion. No interpretations are required. If students provide relevant quotations or refer to schools of thought, they should receive credit in the same way as other forms of evidence. Quality of written communication is assessed in these questions. In the event of a student displaying very good or very poor written communication, you may adjust the mark but only within the same Level. Occasional grammatical mistakes and spelling errors should be overlooked.

**GCE History CCEA Marking Grid for A22
20 Mark Question**

It is important that the student's response is marked holistically and you should consider the following in reaching your mark. You may well see a student working at High Level 4, for example, on some areas but mid-low Level 4 on others. The advice is to go to the midway point in the level and adjust upwards or downwards within that level depending on the quality of the response. You are expected to look for the '**best fit**', bearing in mind that weakness in one area may be compensated for by strength in another.

Level	Response	Understanding of the past	Analysis and Evaluation	Contextual Knowledge	Judgement	Mark
4	Very Good	Very good understanding of the sources – answers are well organised showing a very good understanding of the issue raised by the question	Very well developed explanation, analysis and evaluation	Very good understanding of the sources in relation to the historical context At the lower end of Level 4 – You may see good use of knowledge in relation to the historical context with some gaps	Very good evidence to support the judgement reached At the lower end of Level 4 – You may see strong evidence to support the judgement reached	16–20
3	Good	Good understanding of the sources – answers are well organised showing a good understanding of the issue raised by the question	Developed explanation, analysis and evaluation Mid – Low Level 3 – you may see that students confine their analysis to accepting the proposition	Good understanding of the sources in relation to the historical context Mid – Low Level 3 – You may see some good use of contextual knowledge but students may confine their knowledge to the proposition only	Some good evidence is presented to support the judgement reached Mid –Low Level 3 –You may see some evidence presented to support the judgement reached but it is not fully developed.	11–15

Level	Response	Understanding of the past	Analysis and Evaluation	Contextual Knowledge	Judgement	Mark
2	Satisfactory	A satisfactory understanding of the sources – with occasional lapses in their understanding of the issue raised by the question	Some explanation, analysis and evaluation which is not fully developed Mid-Low Level 2 -- You are likely to see that students simply accept the proposition	Basic understanding of the sources in relation to the historical context Mid-Low Level 2 – You may see that students may display a limited understanding of the historical context	Some limited evidence is presented to support the judgement reached Mid-Low Level 2 – Limited evidence is provided to support the judgement reached. Very little attempt is made to reject the proposition	6–10
1	Basic	A basic understanding of the sources – with frequent lapses in their understanding of the issue raised by the question Students may only discuss one source	The answer is in narrative form with limited explanation, analysis or evaluation	Answers may rely on paraphrasing. Little reference to the sources or the historical context	No judgement is reached and little/ no attempt is made to address the proposition	1–5

**GCE History CCEA Marking Grid for A22
25 Mark Question**

It is important that the student's response is marked holistically and you should consider the following in reaching your mark. You may well see a student working at High Level 4, for example, on some areas but mid-low Level 4 on others. The advice is to go to the midway point in the level and adjust upwards or downwards within that level depending on the quality of the response. You are expected to look for the 'best fit', bearing in mind that weakness in one area may be compensated for by strength in another.

Level	Response	Understanding of the past	Analysis and Evaluation	Contextual Knowledge	Judgement	Mark
4	Very Good	Very good understanding of the interpretations – providing a clear and concise summary of the contrasting arguments put forward by the two historians.	Very good analysis and evaluation of the different interpretations	Very good use of contextual knowledge and a very good understanding of the historical context At the lower end of Level 4 – You may see good use of contextual knowledge	Very good evidence to support the judgement reached on which interpretation candidates find more convincing At the lower end of Level 4 – You may see strong evidence to support the judgement reached	20–25
3	Good	Good understanding of the interpretations – providing a good summary of the contrasting arguments put forward by the two historians.	Good analysis and evaluation of the different interpretations	Good use of contextual knowledge and a good understanding of the historical context Mid-Low Level 3 – You may see some good use of contextual knowledge but there is also some information not linked to the evidence in the extracts	Some good evidence is presented to support the judgement reached on which interpretation students find more convincing Mid-Low Level 3 – You may see some evidence presented to support the judgement reached on which interpretation students find more convincing	14–19

Level	Response	Understanding of the past	Analysis and Evaluation	Contextual Knowledge	Judgement	Mark
2	Satisfactory	A satisfactory understanding of the interpretations providing a sound summary of the contrasting arguments put forward by the two historians	Satisfactory analysis of the different interpretations Mid-Low Level 2 – You may see limited analysis of the different interpretations	Some use of contextual knowledge and candidates may display some understanding of the historical context Mid-Low Level 2 – More limited use of contextual knowledge/ students may display a limited understanding of the historical context	Some evidence to support the judgement reached on which interpretation students find more convincing. Insufficient reference made to the alternative interpretation. Mid-Low Level 2 – Limited evidence is provided to support the judgement reached. Very little reference made to the alternative interpretation	7–13
1	Basic	A limited understanding of the interpretations providing a limited summary of the contrasting arguments put forward by the two historians Students may only discuss one of the interpretations	Limited analysis of the different interpretations	Little or no use of contextual knowledge and a limited understanding of the historical context	No judgement is reached and little/ no attempt is made to identify which interpretation is more convincing	1–6

Option 1: England 1558–1603

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer Questions 1 and 2 and either Question 3(a) or 3(b).

1 (a) **Use Source 1 and your knowledge of this period.**

How valuable is Source 1 to an historian as evidence in a study of the threat posed by Mary, Queen of Scots to Elizabeth I?

This question targets AO2: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

Answers will paraphrase the content of the source and make assertions that are not fully supported. For example, it may be noted that Source 1 is a letter from Sir Francis Walsingham, one of Elizabeth I's senior advisers.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the value of the source, using the content more fully. Source 1 focuses on the establishment of Mary, Queen of Scots' guilt in being part "of the conspiracy" against Elizabeth I. Particular emphasis is given to the fact that even the friends of Mary – namely Lord Lumley and Lord Montague – did not dissent from the view that the Queen of Scots was guilty of plotting against Elizabeth I and was a real threat to her.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of the value of the source and reach a credible conclusion. Answers at this level will examine the authorship and content more closely. Candidates may well consider that the author of Source 1 – Sir Francis Walsingham, the Queen's Principal Secretary – is of significant value in a study of the threat posed by Mary, Queen of Scots to Elizabeth I. The source clearly demonstrates Walsingham's involvement in the investigation of Mary's plotting against Elizabeth and his conviction that Mary's guilt has been established, with even her friends prepared to acknowledge the fact. This argument would be expected to carry weight with Elizabeth I as Walsingham was one of her most trusted and distinguished advisers, a former ambassador to France and, since 1573, a member of the Privy Council and the Queen's Principal Secretary.

Level 4 ([12]–[15])

Answers will use a wide range of criteria to assess value, commenting on the significance of the information provided, authorship, motive, viewpoint, audience and date. Contextual knowledge will be introduced to enhance the answer. Source 1 is an extract from a letter written by Sir Francis Walsingham, the chief government figure involved in investigating the Babington plot against the Queen's life, referred to in the source as "the conspiracy". Mary has been proved to have been complicit in this intrigue to assassinate Elizabeth I; indeed, some would argue that Walsingham had deliberately entrapped the Queen of Scots. The Principal Secretary's network of spies and informers indeed played a critical role in exposing

the treacherous dealings of Anthony Babington with the Queen of Scots. Unbeknown to Mary's own circle of operatives, Walsingham's team of double agents and code experts actually supplied the conspirators with their means of communicating with the Queen of Scots via coded letters smuggled inside a beer barrel. It was these letters that provided the main evidence of Mary's complicity in the effort to depose Elizabeth from the English throne. While candidates may conclude that this source does have significant value for an historian, they may also raise the question of Walsingham's motivation for his actions in this affair, reflective not just of his desire to protect Elizabeth I but also perhaps of his Puritan zeal, something that the Queen herself occasionally remarked on.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [15]

15

(b) Use Source 1 and Source 2 and other evidence you have studied.

How far do the sources support the view that Elizabeth I was entirely blameless for the death of Mary, Queen of Scots?

This question targets AO1 and AO2: AO1 the candidate's ability to 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. **AO2** the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement relating to whether Elizabeth I was entirely blameless for the death of Mary, Queen of Scots. Answers may rely on paraphrasing the sources or provide a narrative of the subject with little reference to the sources.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Answers at this level will demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement relating to whether Elizabeth I was entirely blameless for the death of Mary, Queen of Scots. Candidates might note that Source 1, a letter from Sir Francis Walsingham, provides evidence to suggest that the person chiefly responsible for the death of Mary was the Queen of Scots herself, while Source 2 shows Elizabeth I pleading with the parliamentary delegation that Mary might be spared.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

Answers at this level will demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement are developed and substantiated. Answers will address the sources in more detail, and perhaps confine their analysis

to concurring with the proposition. For example, in his letter to the Earl of Leicester (Source 1), Walsingham points out that even those who were predisposed to be favourable towards Mary, “Lord Lumley and Lord Montague”, like all the other commissioners appointed to consider the evidence, found the Queen of Scots guilty of plotting the assassination of Elizabeth – in other words, guilty of treason. And yet, in Source 2, Elizabeth seeks to avoid the punishment that treason merits, seemingly exasperated by the unanimous advice tendered by her ministers and MPs: “But evidently my safety cannot be guaranteed without a queen’s head being sacrificed.” However, candidates might now begin to consider whether Elizabeth was entirely sincere in her protestations.

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

Answers at this level will demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context. A strong case can be made in support of the proposition, focusing mainly on Source 1, where the fruits of Walsingham’s careful monitoring of the communications of Mary, Queen of Scots – and perhaps also his efforts to entrap her – have produced incontrovertible proof that she has been plotting with Anthony Babington and others to assassinate Elizabeth I and seize the English throne. Candidates might point out that Mary was condemned by her own hand when her letter to Babington effectively sanctioning the assassination attempt fell into the hands of Walsingham. Even those commissioners who were known to be Catholic sympathisers (and who were chosen for that very reason) did not dissent from giving a “verdict against the Scottish queen”. This finding was endorsed by Parliament, but only the monarch could sign the death warrant, and in Source 2, Elizabeth I is reluctant to take that step. Unlike some of her Tudor predecessors, Elizabeth was not a monarch who ever desired to spill blood if it could be avoided, a moderate by the standards of the age. However, in this case it can be debated whether she was entirely blameless of the fate that was shortly to befall her fellow sovereign. Elizabeth may have been moderate, but she was also an astute politician and a wise ruler: as long as Mary survived, subversive elements in the kingdom would continue to be attracted to her cause. Candidates might therefore argue that what we see in Source 2 is a “performance” by Elizabeth, primarily for an international audience, potentially the Emperor, the Pope and Philip II of Spain, designed to absolve her of blame for Mary’s death and to deflect it instead to her ministers, advisers and Parliament. But in doing so, she was seeking not just to protect herself but also the nation.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[20]

20

2 Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Using the interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the problem of the succession and the opposition faced by Elizabeth I at the beginning of her reign do you find more convincing?

This question targets AO3: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

Answers at this level will display a limited understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will reveal a limited analysis of the interpretations of the problem of the succession and the opposition faced by Elizabeth I at the beginning of her reign. Answers at this level will display little or no understanding of the historical context. Responses may discuss only one of the interpretations. Candidates will not identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing or will reach an unsubstantiated judgement.

Level 2 ([7]–[13])

Answers at this level will display a sound understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will attempt to analyse the different interpretations of the problem of the succession and the opposition faced by Elizabeth I at the beginning of her reign. Answers at this level may display some understanding of the historical context. Candidates will reveal a satisfactory understanding of each historian's views in Interpretation A and Interpretation B. In Interpretation A, Bindoff notes that Elizabeth's right to rule was opposed by English Catholics and by Henry II of France. Interpretation B is very much focused on events in Parliament and its confirmation of Elizabeth's accession to the throne. Candidates may identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide some evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 3 ([14]–[19])

Answers at this level will reveal a good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a good analysis and evaluation of the different interpretations of the problem of the succession and the opposition faced by Elizabeth I at the beginning of her reign. Answers at this level will display a good understanding of the historical context. Bindoff focuses on the internal and external challenges Elizabeth I faced at the outset of her reign. He suggests that her right to rule in England was generally questioned by English Catholics, and in an era dominated by religious dispute and conflict, this necessarily weakened her grip on power. Externally, there was a Catholic claimant to the throne in Mary Stuart, the daughter-in-law of the King of France, a claim that might well be backed by the Pope. In contrast, Starkey in Interpretation B implies that there were no such problems surrounding the succession of the young Queen Elizabeth, noting the stamp of approval from Parliament and claiming that "the transition of power was smooth". Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will

provide good evidence in support of their judgement.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Level 4 ([20]–[25])

Answers at this level will reveal a very good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a very good analysis and evaluation of the different interpretations of the problem of the succession and the opposition faced by Elizabeth I at the beginning of her reign. Answers at this level will display a very good understanding of the historical context. It could be argued that Bindoff's analysis in Interpretation A of the problems faced by Elizabeth I at the beginning of her reign is convincing, in that not only does it acknowledge the discontent of English Catholics and the religious and dynastic threat posed from the continent by the likes of Henry II of France, but it also refers to Elizabeth's lack of experience and preparation for the role of monarch. This argument could be developed contextually by noting that the Mary Stuart referred to is of course Mary, Queen of Scots, who would remain a problem for Elizabeth for some time to come. Furthermore, the Catholic challenge from abroad was not confined to France, and candidates might also consider the position taken by Philip II of Spain. A possible counterargument to Interpretation A is that it might be more specific about the domestic Catholic threat, as posed, for example, by the Catholic nobility such as the Duke of Norfolk. Starkey in Interpretation B could scarcely offer a more contrasting interpretation of the succession of Elizabeth I, in that he does not see the new Queen as being beset by problems or being in a vulnerable position. He is exclusively concerned with parliamentary process, and candidates might well argue that this is the critical foundation on which the new reign will be established, possibly developing this point by referring to the fact that Elizabeth uses Parliament early in her reign to resolve the question of religion. A counterargument against Interpretation B is that its focus is too narrow and that another world existed outside Westminster, one which Elizabeth could only ignore at her peril. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide very good evidence in support of their judgement.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[25]

25

- 3 (a) “The foreign policy of Elizabeth I between 1558 and 1603 was dominated by relations with the Netherlands.” How far would you agree with this verdict?

This question targets AO1: the candidate’s ability to 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.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement. Answers at this level will demonstrate superficial understanding of the extent to which the foreign policy of Elizabeth I between 1558 and 1603 was dominated by relations with the Netherlands. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement. The response will have some supporting evidence relating to the extent to which the foreign policy of Elizabeth I between 1558 and 1603 was dominated by relations with the Netherlands. For example, there may be a general reference to the English expedition sent to the Netherlands led by Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgements are developed and substantiated. Candidates might argue that, from at least the beginning of the Dutch Revolt against Spain in 1568, the question of the Netherlands did indeed drive English foreign policy. As another Protestant nation (in the making, at least), fighting against Europe’s greatest Catholic power, there was much sympathy in England and at the court of Elizabeth I for the Dutch rebels. In particular, the Queen was under constant pressure from the likes of Burghley and Walsingham to offer English military support to the Dutch, arguing that, by sending a military expedition to the Netherlands, they would keep the Spanish occupied and reduce the threat that Philip II posed to England. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary.

Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and concisely. Explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. Candidates might argue further in support of the proposition that Elizabeth eventually sanctioned a military expedition to the Netherlands in 1585, under the command of the Earl of Leicester, but only because the Dutch Revolt appeared to be on the point of collapse, and such an outcome would not have been in England's interests. At one point, the Dutch rebels were even prepared to offer Elizabeth sovereignty of the Netherlands, but the Queen declined, confirming her wariness about becoming too heavily engaged in the Low Countries. Candidates might well make the point that Elizabeth's policy towards the Netherlands was always calculated on the basis of how it would affect relations with Spain, and from this foundation a strong counterargument to the proposition can be constructed. Arguably, it was Spain which dominated English foreign policy, firstly in the form of Elizabeth playing Philip II along as a serious contender for her hand in marriage, but increasingly as a likely enemy who had to be treated with great caution and diplomatic skill. This manoeuvring also frequently involved France. Relations with Scotland might also be considered, ranging from support for the Scottish Protestant reformers in the early part of Elizabeth's reign to the increasingly close alliance with James VI, the Queen's most likely heir. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [20]

20

- (b) "In her dealings with Parliament in the period 1558–1603, Elizabeth I was always securely in control." To what extent would you accept this statement?

This question targets AO1: the candidate's ability to 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.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement. Answers at this level will demonstrate superficial understanding of whether Elizabeth I was always securely in control in her dealings with Parliament in the period 1558–1603. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary.

Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement. The response will have some supporting evidence relating to whether Elizabeth I was always securely in control in her dealings with Parliament in the period 1558–1603. For example, candidates might note that, despite pressure from Parliament to marry, the Queen refused to budge, and made her MPs aware of this in no uncertain terms. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgements are developed and substantiated. Candidates may note that Elizabeth's control of her Parliaments in the period 1558–1603 was assisted by the presence of Privy Councillors in the House of Commons, part of whose function was effectively to act as parliamentary managers and ensure that business was generally conducted in the Queen's interests. Parliament was usually willing to grant subsidies to the Crown, for example to fund the military campaign in Ireland in defence of the realm when threatened by the Spanish Armada. While the Puritan faction in the House of Commons grew more vocal as the reign progressed, the key fact is that the Elizabethan Church settlement stood fast. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and concisely. Explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. Candidates might develop an argument in support of the proposition by referring to the case of the Puritan MP Peter Wentworth, who, when he challenged the Queen's refusal to allow Parliament to discuss matters of religion in 1576, found himself imprisoned in the Tower of London for a month. A relevant statistic on this subject is that during a 45-year reign, Parliament met only 13 times, for an average of three weeks per year. As a possible counterargument to the proposition, candidates may argue that, while Elizabeth I may ultimately have retained the upper hand, her grip became less sure as age and infirmity began to take their toll, especially in the closing decade of her life. This might be evidenced by the growing assertiveness of Parliament, for example on the issue of monopolies, obliging Elizabeth to compromise and withdraw some of the grants she had made. This was something that the young Queen Elizabeth would

not have countenanced. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[20]

Option 1

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

20

80

Option 2: Ireland 1685–1714

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer Questions 1 and 2 and either Question 3(a) or 3(b).

1 (a) **Use Source 1 and your knowledge of this period.**

How valuable is Source 1 to an historian as evidence in a study of the Penal Laws?

This question targets AO2: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

Answers will paraphrase the content of each source and make assertions that are not fully supported. For example, it may be noted that Source 1 is a letter from a Catholic priest talking about the Bishops' Banishment Bill of 1697.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the value of the source, using the content more fully. Source 1 provides a Catholic perspective on the Bishops' Banishment Bill, asserting that the Bill will effectively leave the ordinary people – “the faithful of this poor kingdom” – without the guidance of the Catholic Church. The letter to the Austrian ambassador in London also makes the important point that the proposed legislation was in conflict with the Treaty of Limerick.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of the value of the source and reach a credible conclusion. Answers at this level will examine the authorship and content more closely. Candidates may well consider that, while the author of Source 1 is not identified by name, the fact that the letter is from an Irish Catholic priest enhances its value, especially as he is talking about a specific Penal Law that is about to be placed on the statute book, though it has seemingly not yet received the royal assent. As well as explaining how this law will have a negative impact on the operation of the Catholic Church in Ireland and therefore on the ordinary adherents to the Catholic religion (the vast majority of the Irish population), the priest also argues that the Bishops' Banishment Bill contravenes the Treaty of Limerick of 1691.

Level 4 ([12]–[15])

Answers will use a wide range of criteria to assess value, commenting on the significance of the information provided, authorship, motive, viewpoint, audience and date. Contextual knowledge will be introduced to enhance the answer. Source 1 is focused on the legislation that four days later became the Bishops' Banishment Act. Candidates might note that, according to the author of the source, who is of course not an uninterested observer, the proposed Act is an extreme measure, in that, in addition to Catholic bishops, the members of religious orders – “all monks and nuns” – are also to be banished from Ireland. The argument that is developed in Source 1 suggests that proposed law will make it very difficult for the Catholic Church to survive,

effectively leaving the “faithful in this poor kingdom” without the consolation of their religion. The final point in the source is perhaps the most important, considering that this case is ultimately directed at a Protestant king (William III) and a Protestant Parliament, as it notes that the Bishops’ Banishment Bill is not just at variance with the spirit of the Treaty of Limerick, which ended the Williamite Wars in 1691, but also with the letter of that treaty. Candidates may indeed conclude that this source, referring as it does to the first Penal Law to directly address the practice of the Catholic religion in Ireland, is of considerable value, but might also consider how representative this legislation was of the Penal Laws as a whole.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [15]

15

(b) Use Source 1 and Source 2 and other evidence you have studied.

How far do the sources support the view that the Penal Laws aimed to eradicate the Catholic religion in Ireland?

This question targets AO1 and AO2: AO1 the candidate’s ability to 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. **AO2** the candidate’s ability to analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement relating to whether the Penal Laws were intended to eradicate the Catholic religion in Ireland. Answers may rely on paraphrasing the sources or provide a narrative of the subject with little reference to the sources.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Answers at this level will demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement relating to whether the Penal Laws were intended to eradicate the Catholic religion in Ireland. Candidates might note that Source 1 presents a highly critical Catholic view of the specific Bill in question, while Source 2 gives the opinion of a Protestant bishop as to what legislative action needs to be taken against the Catholic Church in Ireland.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

Answers at this level will demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement are developed and substantiated. Answers will address the sources in more detail, and perhaps confine their analysis to concurring with the proposition. For example, the Irish Catholic author of Source 1 appears to fully support the proposition, arguing on the basis of a

not unreasonable logic that, by removing bishops, you remove the possibility of ordaining new priests, ultimately resulting in the Irish Catholic people being left without spiritual support and guidance. However, candidates might consider that the Church of Ireland bishop writing in Source 2 is not proposing anything so radical. Although he is of the view that the Catholic Church is ultimately exploitative of the native Irish, he is prepared to acknowledge that members of the religious orders, such as monks, pose no threat and in fact try to do some good. These are not the words of someone intent on eradicating the Catholic religion.

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

Answers at this level will demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context. A case can be made in support of the proposition, in which it would be expected that the content of Source 1 will feature prominently. The Irish Catholic priest makes a compelling case that, although the Bishops' Banishment Bill targets specific areas of the Church, namely bishops, senior clergy, trainee priests (who were effectively missionary priests) and the members of religious orders, rather than authorising a blanket ban on Catholic practice, the net result will be much the same. The reference to the Treaty of Limerick indicates that the priest believes that an appeal by the Austrian ambassador to William III on these grounds might be the best strategy to employ in order to get the King to veto the proposed legislation. However, William was still on the continent, where the Nine Years' War had just ended, and in his absence, Lords Justices were empowered to give the royal assent to legislation passed by the Irish Parliament, only consulting the King when they felt it was necessary. In this case it was the Irish Lords Justices who gave the royal assent. There is scope for a substantive counterargument to the proposition, perhaps noting initially that Source 2 provides no evidence of a desire to wipe out Catholicism in Ireland; quite the reverse, in fact. Furthermore, the Bishops' Banishment Act, for all its draconian content, was not a law that was rigidly enforced, proven by the survival of Catholicism in Ireland. The context should also be borne in mind. Arguably, this Act is a by-product of the Nine Years' War, when Protestant fears of Franco-Irish co-operation to overthrow the new Protestant order in Ireland were at their peak. The war might formally have ended in 1697, but Protestant fears remained. On the broader point of the Penal Laws, candidates might consider the Bishops' Banishment Act and similar religiously oriented legislation to be the least important of the Penal statutes, certainly the least rigidly applied, unlike the laws relating to property ownership and civil and political rights.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[20]

20

AVAILABLE
MARKS

2 Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Using the interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the changing position of Catholics and Protestants in England in the period 1685–1689 do you find more convincing?

This question targets AO3: the candidate’s ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

Answers at this level will display a limited understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will reveal a limited analysis of the interpretations of the changing position of Catholics and Protestants in England in the period 1685–1689. Answers at this level will display little or no understanding of the historical context. Responses may discuss only one of the interpretations. Candidates will not identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing or will reach an unsubstantiated judgement.

Level 2 ([7]–[13])

Answers at this level will display a sound understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will attempt to analyse the different interpretations of the changing position of Catholics and Protestants in England in the period 1685–1689. Answers at this level may display some understanding of the historical context. Candidates will reveal a satisfactory understanding of each historian’s views in Interpretation A and Interpretation B. In Interpretation A, Schama focuses on James II’s policy of toleration. Like Interpretation A, Interpretation B also makes reference to toleration, but sees it as the “natural first step to the revival of Catholicism” in England. Candidates may identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide some evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 3 ([14]–[19])

Answers at this level will reveal a good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a good analysis and evaluation of the different interpretations of the changing position of Catholics and Protestants in England in the period 1685–1689. Answers at this level will display a good understanding of the historical context. Schama presents toleration as James II’s guiding principle and notes that it was to apply to Catholics and Protestant Dissenters, earning him the support of the likes of William Penn. In contrast, Churchill, while acknowledging that James did indeed pursue a policy of religious toleration, argues that it was a “tactical” manoeuvre intended simply to advance his real objective: the restoration of Catholicism. This interpretation is supported by citing the promotion of Catholics and demotion of Protestants in government, evidence of the changing position of Catholics and Protestants in England. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide good evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 4 ([20]–[25])

Answers at this level will reveal a very good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a very good analysis and evaluation of the different interpretations of the changing position of Catholics and Protestants in England in the period 1685–1689. Answers at this level will display a very good understanding of the historical context. It could be argued that in essence Schama is claiming in Interpretation A that, while James II's policy of toleration did bring about change, it was change that was to the greater good of the community and which attracted widespread support. This is backed up by reference to the steadfast support the King received both from prominent Dissenters, such as William Penn, and prominent Anglicans, such as the noted diarist Samuel Pepys, who occupied an important post in government as Secretary of the Navy. For Schama, this is an enlightened policy, for which James II should receive credit rather than criticism. However, candidates may challenge Interpretation A by pointing out that figures such as Penn and Pepys were not representative of the wider English nation. Schama's interpretation could be challenged as superficial, providing a very selective picture of religious change and its consequences in the period in question. Churchill offers a very different interpretation of the changing position of Catholics and Protestants in England, one that is arguably more substantive and balanced than that provided in Interpretation A. Churchill sees toleration not as an objective in itself but as a means to an end, that end being the restoration of the Catholic Church and faith in England. Toleration of Protestant Dissenters was therefore only a smokescreen for much more fundamental change. And that change had already begun: the Protestant Halifax removed from office; the Catholic Sunderland made Lord President. But perhaps the most significant name cited by Churchill is that of Jeffreys – Judge Jeffreys of the Bloody Assizes, the man responsible for sending to their death some 300 West Country men and women in the aftermath of the Monmouth Rebellion in 1685. The mention of Louis XIV is also relevant, for he was James II's closest ally and arguably mentor – and whose persecution of French Protestants James supported. A possible challenge to Interpretation B is that it seems to rush to judgement on James II and is perhaps overly cynical about the policy of toleration (precisely Schama's point at the end of Interpretation A). Nonetheless, Churchill provides much food for thought on the question of religious change under James II. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide very good evidence in support of their judgement.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[25]

25

AVAILABLE
MARKS

- 3 (a) “James II’s pro-Catholic policies in Ireland in the period 1685–1689 were only strictly implemented in the army.” To what extent do you agree with this judgement?

This question targets AO1: the candidate’s ability to 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.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement. Answers at this level will demonstrate superficial understanding of whether the policy of Catholicisation in Ireland in the period 1685–1689 was only strictly implemented in the army. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement. The response will have some supporting evidence relating to whether the policy of Catholicisation in Ireland in the period 1685–1689 was only strictly implemented in the army. For example, there may be a general reference to the introduction of Catholics to all ranks of the Irish army during the reign of James II. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgements are developed and substantiated. Candidates might argue that James II’s appointment of Tyrconnell as Lieutenant General of the Irish army in 1685 – two years before he was made Lord Deputy of Ireland – was an indication that he wished to prioritise reform of the army above any other plans for Catholicisation of the Irish administration. This argument can be substantiated by considering the pace at which Catholicisation of the Irish army proceeded. By September 1686, what had once been a totally Protestant force had now a very different complexion: of the 7485 soldiers, 5043 were Catholic (67 per cent); as were 166 out of 414 officers (40 per cent) and 251 out of 765 non-commissioned officers (33 per cent). By the end of 1688 the army was almost entirely Catholic. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style

of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and concisely. Explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. Candidates might argue that Catholicisation of the Irish army was the most dramatic of all James II's policies in Ireland and, as a consequence, produced the most immediate and sustained negative response on the part of the Protestant population. This was particularly the case in Ulster, where folk memory of the 1641 Rebellion was very much alive. However, there is scope for a strong counterargument on the grounds that significant Catholicisation occurred in other areas, and that these reforms as a whole were but a prelude to the ultimate objective – of Tyrconnell, if not James II – which was reversal of the Cromwellian land settlement. This required more than the creation of a strong and reliable Catholic army and hence Catholicisation of the civil administration and municipal corporations was carried out concurrently with reform of the army. By the end of 1688 Catholics had gained a two-thirds majority in most corporations and now dominated the Irish Privy Council: Protestants in effect had lost control of central and local government. Catholicisation of the judiciary completed the subjugation of Protestant Ireland. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [20]

20

- (b) “The Second Siege of Limerick was the most critical military engagement in determining the outcome of the Williamite Wars.” How far would you accept this verdict?

This question targets AO1: the candidate's ability to 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.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement. Answers at this level will demonstrate superficial understanding of whether the Second Siege of Limerick was the most critical military engagement in determining the outcome of the Williamite Wars. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The

organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement. The response will have some supporting evidence relating to whether the Second Siege of Limerick was the most critical military engagement in determining the outcome of the Williamite Wars. For example, candidates might note that the Second Siege of Limerick was the last engagement of the Williamite Wars, proving that the war was still a contest and that the Jacobites were not yet defeated. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgements are developed and substantiated. Candidates might acknowledge that, despite the military reverses they had previously suffered, the Jacobites were still able to muster a force some 14 000 strong at Limerick. Furthermore, the defences of Limerick had been considerably strengthened since the previous siege in 1690. However, a counterargument might focus on the respective morale of the two sides and contrast the buoyant mood of the Williamites with the low spirits of the Jacobites after a run of Williamite successes. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and concisely. Explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. Candidates might note that, while the Battle of Aughrim did not quite deliver a knockout blow to the Jacobites in July 1691 and Patrick Sarsfield was able to negotiate quite generous surrender terms from Baron de Ginkel at the end of the Siege of Limerick, that battle had critically weakened the Jacobites. Not only had they lost their inspirational leader, St Ruth, but 4000 of their men had been killed and thousands more taken prisoner. Defeat at Aughrim had been followed by the loss of Galway, another blow to morale. Indeed, it could be argued that from an Irish point of view, the defence of Limerick was simply a tactic to get the best possible terms from the Williamites to conclude a war that the Jacobites had now no hope of winning. This is perhaps demonstrated by Sarsfield supplanting the French commanders Chevalier de Tessé and the Marquis d'Usson and opening negotiations with Ginkel. The French and Irish were always uneasy allies, but by this stage it seemed to the Irish that the French wanted to prolong the conflict in order to keep Williamite troops occupied and away from the continental theatre

of the Nine Years' War. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[20]

Option 2

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

20

80

Option 3: Ireland 1778–1803

AVAILABLE
MARKS

The Volunteers 1778–1783

Answer Questions 1 and 2 and either Question 3(a) or 3(b).

1 (a) **Use Source 1 and your knowledge of this period.**

How valuable is Source 1 to an historian as evidence in a study of the Volunteers between 1778 and 1783?

This question targets AO2: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

Answers will paraphrase the content of the source and make assertions that are not fully supported, nor consider the influence of the Volunteers. For example, it may be noted that Source 1 is Charlemont's description of the emergence of the Volunteers, which concentrates on the military function at a time when foreign invasion was feared.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the value of Source 1 using the content more fully. Source 1 focuses on the emergence of the Volunteers at a time of crisis and their role is discussed primarily in terms of military necessity, when "serious invasion was expected hourly." The author, Lord Charlemont, was a leading Volunteer and this adds value to the source. The source content emphasises a heroic role for the Volunteers; self-funded and organised without assistance from government. Charlemont's admiration for the Volunteers is seen in his comment that they "boldly undertook" their own defence. The source is valuable because it tells us that the Volunteers spread quickly at a time when the administration was in a "panic."

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of the value of the source and reach a credible conclusion. Answers at this level will examine the authorship and content more closely. Candidates may well consider that the authorship of Source 1 adds value since Charlemont was a member of the Irish Lords and head of the Volunteers. Charlemont is discussing the Volunteers as defenders of Ireland during the American War, and there is also a clear sense that the government was suspicious of their independence. Despite the administration's reliance on the Volunteers, they were feared and hated and the government saw the movement as "most alarming." Answers at this level will acknowledge the need for the Volunteers but also the extent to which they posed a challenge to the authorities because of their organisation and independence.

Level 4 ([12]–[15])

Answers will use a wide range of criteria to assess value, commenting on the significance of the information provided, authorship, motive, viewpoint, audience and date. Contextual knowledge will be introduced to enhance

the answer. Source 1 has value because of the author and his position in the Volunteers and as a leading Patriot. Charlemont's account details the reasons for the emergence of the Volunteers and with it their influence, since the government – while suspicious – needed the help of Volunteer companies due to Ireland's vulnerability. Charlemont's view that the government "feared and consequently hated the Volunteers" suggests that they had influence of the "most alarming" nature. Of course, Charlemont's account (1786) was a justification of the movement and his role in it; his authorship and the date might be considered a limitation. Charlemont confines his discussion to the military side of the Volunteers and makes no direct reference to the more political demands that the movement made during the 1779–1783 period, such as the campaign for free trade and the Dungannon Convention of February 1782.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [15]

(b) Use Source 1 and Source 2 and other evidence you have studied.

How far do the sources support the view that the Volunteers posed a threat to the way Ireland was governed?

15

This question targets AO1 and AO2: AO1 the candidate's ability to 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. **AO2** the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement relating to whether the Volunteers posed a threat to the way Ireland was governed. Answers may rely on paraphrasing the sources or provide a narrative of the subject with little reference to the sources.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Answers at this level will demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement relating to whether the Volunteers posed a threat to the way Ireland was governed. Candidates might note that, while Source 1 discusses the aim of securing Ireland against the risk of invasion, it also maintains that the government was alarmed by volunteering, while Source 2 voices concern about the Volunteers' political demands by 1783.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

Answers at this level will demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement are developed and substantiated. Answers will

address the sources in more detail, and perhaps confine their analysis to concurring with the proposition that the Volunteers posed a threat to the way Ireland was governed. For example, Source 1 was written by Charlemont, who was known to be a reformer, and the source suggests that the government was fearful of the Volunteers and their “most alarming” nature. Source 2 confirms the reforming nature of the Volunteers and details how the resolutions calling for political change (a feature of the discussions at the Rotunda Convention in Dublin in November 1783) were considered a threat to the position of MPs in the Irish Parliament and the operation of that Parliament. MPs like Yelverton reflected a mood that had become critical of the Volunteers pushing for changes beyond those achieved in 1782 and which saw the Volunteers as an external threat to the power of the Irish Parliament and the interests of Ascendancy power.

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

Answers at this level will demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context. Both sources show that the Volunteers carried an implied or real threat. In Source 1, we hear that the Irish administration “feared and consequently hated the Volunteers” and that the movement “was most alarming.” The Volunteers assumed a level of independence from the state and formed an extra-parliamentary aid to the Patriot opposition in College Green, exerting their power at reviews and demonstrations like that in Dublin in November 1779. Despite this, candidates should also contend that the government was forced to rely on the Volunteers because of the military and economic vulnerability of the country and, while the Volunteers were a threat, they were also necessary for fulfilling policing duties and military defence, especially against the prospect of foreign invasion. The Volunteers carried a threat when they called for legislative independence in 1781–1782, culminating in the Dungannon Convention of February 1782, when the Volunteers welcomed the relaxation of the Penal Laws and demanded political change. In Source 2, Yelverton acknowledges that the Volunteers had played a necessary role in protecting Ireland from invasion, but alleges that the Bill originating in the Dublin Convention was a threat to the way Ireland was governed, since it would threaten the position and power of MPs and hold them accountable to the Volunteers. Candidates may employ wider knowledge to mention that Flood presented the Bill to Parliament in his Volunteer uniform. Candidates at this level will recognise that the temporary alliance between the Irish Parliament and the Volunteers (which had helped create the conditions for legislative independence to be granted) had come to an end; Charlemont, Grattan and their supporters were critical of Flood’s position and of the discussions that had taken place in the Dublin Convention, while conservative Members of Parliament would have opposed such a radical agenda, accusing the Volunteers of holding Parliament to ransom by the threat of force.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [20]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

20

2 Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Using the interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the reasons for the failure of the 1798 Rebellion do you find more convincing?

This question targets AO3: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

Answers at this level will display a limited understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will reveal a limited analysis of the interpretations of the reasons for the failure of the 1798 Rebellion. Answers at this level will display little or no understanding of the historical context. Responses may discuss only one of the interpretations. Candidates will not identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing or will reach an unsubstantiated judgement.

Level 2 ([7]–[13])

Answers at this level will display a sound understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will attempt to analyse the different interpretations of the reasons for the failure of the 1798 Rebellion. Answers at this level may display some understanding of the historical context. Candidates will reveal a satisfactory understanding of each historian's views in Interpretation A and Interpretation B. In Interpretation A, Curtin focuses not only on the rebellion in Ulster being an anti-climax, but also on the fact that the militia was loyal to the government and the French failed to land in sufficient numbers or at the right time. In Interpretation B, Whelan focuses on the promotion of the Orange Order as a tool of counter-revolution in the government's strategy of repression. The Order increased levels of sectarian animosity before the Rising and helped to prevent the unity of Catholics, Protestants and Dissenters. Candidates may identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide some evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 3 ([14]–[19])

Answers at this level will reveal a good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a good analysis and evaluation of the different interpretations of the reasons for the failure of the 1798 Rebellion. Answers at this level will display a good understanding of the historical context. In Interpretation A, Curtin discusses a number of factors, namely the limited response from Ulster, the extent to which informers undermined the movement and the failure of leadership. The main emphasis is on the failure of the militia to fall in behind the rebels, despite the opposition to the Militia Act and the fact that the United Irishmen had been attempting to attract Catholic militiamen. The failure of the French to arrive when expected is also mentioned by Curtin. Tone's negotiations and the Bantry scare (1796) had, for many United Irishmen, made any future rebellion dependent on French assistance. Interpretation B also mentions the militia and how the Orange Order was used by the Ascendancy to prevent any co-operation between Catholics and Protestants by "neutralising units of the United Irishmen",

especially in religiously complex areas such as Armagh and Down, reducing the potency of the rebels. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide good evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 4 ([20]–[25])

Answers at this level will reveal a very good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a very good analysis and evaluation of the different interpretations of the reasons for the failure of the 1798 Rebellion. Answers at this level will display a very good understanding of the historical context. It could be argued that Curtin’s analysis in Interpretation A is fully justified. The dragooning of Ulster had blunted the United Irishmen there. Informers like Newell and Mageean had undermined the cohesion of the United Irishmen. Despite some disloyalty (shown by members of the Monaghan Militia at Blaris Camp in 1797), the militia played a leading role in the suppression of the revolt. The issue of whether to rise with or without a French landing divided the leadership of the United Irishmen, with Thomas Addis Emmet and Robert Simms expressing caution, while Fitzgerald, Neilson and McCracken were prepared to strike. The impressive performance of Humbert’s forces in 1798 would suggest that the lack of French assistance may indeed have been crucial. A possible challenge to Interpretation A is that the connection with France was as much a weakness to United Irish strategy as a strength. Whelan’s emphasis in Interpretation B focuses on the use of the Orange Order as a counter-revolutionary force. Despite its lower class origins in 1795, the Order fell under the influence of local gentry in places like County Armagh. Fomenting division among the United Irishmen and Defenders was critical to the weakening of the United Irishmen in advance of the Rebellion. A possible challenge to Interpretation B is that the government tactic of creating divisions did not actually prevent the outbreak of the Rebellion. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide very good evidence in support of their judgement.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[25]

25

AVAILABLE
MARKS

- 3 (a) “The most important reason for the establishment of the Society of United Irishmen in 1791 was the influence of the French Revolution.” How far would you agree with this assessment?

This question targets AO1: the candidate’s ability to 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.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement. Answers at this level will demonstrate superficial understanding of whether the influence of the French Revolution was the most important reason for the establishment of the United Irishmen. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement. The response will have some supporting evidence relating to whether the influence of the French Revolution was the most important reason for the establishment of the United Irishmen. For example, there may be general reference to the French Revolution’s attack on traditional political and religious authority and how the ideas of Thomas Paine and Theobald Wolfe Tone were important in shaping opinion in Ireland. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgements are developed and substantiated. The French Revolution reflected the ideas of the Enlightenment, appealing to a reform tradition that had been quiet since 1783–1784. Events in Paris seemed to provide a template for change and Thomas Paine’s defence of the Revolution in *The Rights of Man* was read enthusiastically in Belfast. The parallels between *ancien régime* France and Ireland were not lost on some. Tone’s *Argument on Behalf of the Catholics of Ireland* drew attention to French Catholic support for change and this persuaded many Presbyterians in Ulster – despite their traditional suspicions – to trust Catholics as the agents of political change. The revival of the Volunteers and the celebration of the anniversary of the fall of the Bastille in Belfast in 1791 helped to create

the climate for the establishment of the United Irishmen, which called for a fundamental change in the workings of the Irish Parliament and the removal of sectarian divisions. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and concisely. Explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. Candidates might argue that the French Revolution transformed Irish politics by highlighting the unrepresentative nature of the Irish Parliament, opening up the possibilities of Catholics as an agent of change alongside disempowered Presbyterians and enlightened Anglicans, such as Tone and Thomas Russell. The timing of the establishment of the United Irishmen ties them to the influence of the French Revolution and the change in the political fortunes of the Third Estate there. While the French Revolution inspired Irish reformers, candidates at this level will discuss other influences on the formation of the United Irishmen, for example, how a reform tradition predated 1789. Grievances about the nature of Ascendancy control and English influence had been in existence for years and the rise of the reform-minded Volunteers coincided with the politicising of Ulster Presbyterians. The nature of Belfast politics and the rise of a prosperous yet politically frustrated merchant class might also be addressed. William Drennan had considered the establishment of a political society as early as 1784, years before the French Revolution. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [20] 20

- (b) “The Act of Union of 1800 was successfully managed through the Irish Parliament because the supporters of the Union were more united than its opponents.” To what extent would you agree with this assessment?

This question targets AO1: the candidate’s ability to 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.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement. Answers at this level will demonstrate superficial understanding of whether

the Act of Union of 1800 was successfully managed through the Irish Parliament because the supporters of the Union were more united than its opponents. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement. The response will have some supporting evidence relating to whether the Act of Union of 1800 was successfully managed through the Irish Parliament because the supporters of the Union were more united than its opponents. Supporters of the Union had the backing of Pitt, as well as the Viceroy (Cornwallis) and Chief Secretary (Castlereagh). Opponents of the Union included Whigs such as Grattan and conservatives like John Foster, who opposed the Union for very different reasons. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgements are developed and substantiated. Candidates should explore the reasons why the supporters of the Union were successful because they were more united than their opponents. Pitt, Cornwallis and Castlereagh were able to use the fear of another uprising and foreign invasion as a reason for supporting the Union, which had already passed in Westminster. The supporters of the Union argued that Ireland would not only be safer, but would enjoy greater economic prosperity, as Scotland had done after the Union of 1707. The Union was also supported as a means of protecting the Irish Protestant minority. Opposition to the Union was weakened by the fact that the Whigs were a minority voice in the Irish Parliament and disliked the measure because it undermined the legislative independence of 1782. Others believed that the Union would lead to a reduction in Ascendancy power and status. A lack of any united voice against the Union was a weakness. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and concisely. Explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgements are very well developed and substantiated as candidates fully address the argument that the supporters of the Act of Union were more united than the opponents of the measure. Candidates may argue that, while the supporters of the Act of Union put forward a united argument, the passage of the measure was only made likely because the

Earl of Clare had insisted that Catholic Emancipation should not be included, allowing the Act of Union to be carried. Candidates at this level should also acknowledge that the unity of the supporters' case on its own was insufficient for the measure to be passed, since the Irish Commons had rejected the principle in early 1799. A counter-argument can be made to state that the Union was passed because the administration used the power of patronage to allow the vote to succeed, including the use of compensation, the packing of both Houses with Union supporters and promises of promotions. Support for the Union had also been strengthened by pro-Union pamphlets and a positive momentum for the measure, which brought a majority of MPs into line. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[20]

Option 3

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

20

80

Option 4: Partition of Ireland 1900–1925

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer Questions 1 and 2 and either Question 3(a) or 3(b).

1 (a) Use Source 1 and your knowledge of this period.

How valuable is Source 1 to an historian as evidence in a study of the reasons for the defeat of the Irish Parliamentary Party in the General Election of 1918?

This question targets AO2: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

Answers will paraphrase the content of the source and make assertions that are not fully supported. For example, the source contains some of the reasons why the Irish Parliamentary Party (IPP) was defeated in the 1918 General Election.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the value of the source, using the content more fully. Source 1 is valuable because it shows that John Dillon believed that the IPP declined, not only because it made “too many concessions”, but also due to the actions of the British government.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of the value of Source 1 and reach a credible conclusion. Answers at this level will examine the authorship and content more closely. The author of Source 1 is John Dillon, the leader of the IPP, which makes him well placed to comment on his party's situation. He was frustrated by the weakness of his party's position in November 1918, and blamed his party's unpopularity on the way it had been treated by the British government over the past five years. The “delayed hopes” of Home Rule had led to a sense of disillusionment and a lack of trust in constitutional politics among the Irish public, who had started to believe that their rights could only be won by “force”.

Level 4 ([12]–[15])

Answers will use a wide range of criteria to assess value, commenting on the significance of the information provided, authorship, motive, viewpoint, audience and date. Contextual knowledge will be introduced to enhance the answer. A month before the General Election of December 1918, the leader of the IPP publicly acknowledges that his party is unpopular amongst the Irish people, who are disillusioned with constitutional methods, and criticises the British government for the situation. Answers may comment that Source 1 contains a range of possible reasons for the defeat of the IPP. These include the repeated concessions made on the question of Home Rule over the last five years, such as Redmond's acceptance of what he believed to be an offer of temporary partition at the Lloyd George talks in July 1916, which damaged the party's credibility amongst nationalists; and the IPP's participation in the Irish Convention from July 1917 to April 1918, which was

another unsuccessful attempt to achieve a political settlement. The actions of the British government had also benefited Sinn Féin. Source 1 refers to the arrest of Sinn Féin's leaders, when 73 of them were detained by the British authorities in the so-called German plot in May 1918. Griffith's arrest helped him to win him sympathy and then the East Cavan by-election in June 1918 by 3785 to 2581 votes. The source also draws attention to the victories of the IPP in by-elections in South Armagh, East Tyrone and Waterford City in early 1918. According to Dillon's argument, these successes showed a turning of the tide back towards the IPP, but the government ruined this chance of recovery by proposing to extend conscription to Ireland in April 1918. The Conscription Crisis united all shades of Irish nationalism, but the Catholic hierarchy's association with Sinn Féin during the course of the anti-conscription campaign conferred a new respectability on the Sinn Féin movement to the detriment of the IPP.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [15]

15

(b) Use Source 1 and Source 2 and other evidence you have studied.

How far do the sources support the view that the actions of Sinn Féin were the main cause of the defeat of the Irish Parliamentary Party in the General Election of 1918?

This question targets AO1 and AO2: AO1 the candidate's ability to 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. **AO2** the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement. For example, Sources 1 and 2 deal with some of the causes of the defeat of the Irish Parliamentary Party in December 1918. Answers may rely on paraphrasing the sources or provide a narrative of the subject with little reference to the sources.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Answers at this level will demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement. For example, both sources refer to reasons why the IPP was defeated. It made too many concessions and the British government postponed Home Rule. Sinn Féin benefited from the Irish Labour Party's decision not to contest the election.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

Answers at this level will demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement are developed and substantiated. Answers will address the sources in more detail, and perhaps confine their analysis to concurring with the proposition. O'Brien's memoir supports the proposition as it highlights actions taken by Sinn Féin in the run-up to the 1918 General Election. However, Dillon's speech blames his party's decline on the actions of the British government which had made mistakes, including wringing concessions from the IPP, failing to implement Home Rule and proposing to introduce conscription.

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

Answers at this level will demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context. In Source 1, Dillon recalls that the IPP made a series of concessions from 1914 to 1918. Most of these concessions were made by his predecessor, John Redmond, in negotiations such as during the Irish Convention of 1917–1918. As a result of the concessions and the fact that the British government failed to deliver Home Rule, Dillon believes that the electorate has lost faith in constitutional politics. Despite this, he believes that the IPP was showing signs of recovery in the spring of 1918, as evidenced in by-election successes. This positive trend, however, was scuppered by the actions of the British government in announcing conscription and arresting 73 Sinn Féin leaders, such as Arthur Griffith, who became 'heroes'. Griffith, in fact, went on to win the East Cavan by-election by over 1000 votes. In Source 2, O'Brien focuses on the actions of Sinn Féin ahead of the 1918 General Election, such as its shrewd move in persuading the Irish Labour Party not to take part in the election. O'Brien's memory of Sinn Féin is of a disciplined party which either controlled or inspired its members. He refers to two of the pledges in Sinn Féin's election manifesto – to achieve a Republic and to abstain from Westminster. Source 2 suggests that, had it not been for the pact between Irish Labour Party and Sinn Féin, some IPP candidates may have won seats 'on a split vote'.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[20]

20

2 Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Using the interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the outcome of the Home Rule crisis by September 1914 do you find more convincing?

This question targets AO3: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

Answers at this level will display a limited understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will reveal a limited analysis of the interpretations of the outcome of the Home Rule crisis by September 1914. Answers at this level will display little or no understanding of the historical context. Responses may discuss only one of the interpretations. Candidates will not identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing or will reach an unsubstantiated judgement.

Level 2 ([7]–[13])

Answers at this level will display a sound understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will attempt to analyse the different interpretations of the outcome of the Home Rule crisis by September 1914. Answers at this level may display some understanding of the historical context. Candidates will reveal a satisfactory understanding of each historian's views in Interpretation A and Interpretation B. Interpretation A emphasises Redmond's victory in finally securing Home Rule. Conservatives and Unionists were angry and bitter that Home Rule had been passed. The undefined amending bill gave them no guarantees. In contrast, Interpretation B argues that the real "victory" actually lay with the Ulster Unionists, who had already won over the Liberal government to the principle of exclusion; and it also maintains that Redmond had nothing to show for the Home Rule Act, given its suspension until the end of the war. Candidates may identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide some evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 3 ([14]–[19])

Answers at this level will reveal a good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a good analysis and evaluation of the different interpretations of the outcome of the Home Rule crisis by September 1914. Answers at this level will display a good understanding of the historical context. Candidates may expand on the view of Interpretation A that Redmond had secured an historic victory in seeing Home Rule passed and the fact that his positive mood was echoed by Nationalist celebrations across Ireland. On the other hand, Unionists and Conservatives such as Bonar Law felt bitter and were uncertain about whether exclusion would become a reality. Meanwhile, Asquith was relieved that the outbreak of war had postponed the 'Irish question', which had caused great difficulty for his government and exposed his own failings in leadership. Like Interpretation A, Interpretation B acknowledges the celebrations of Nationalists, who had achieved their aim of Home Rule, and supports the assertion in Interpretation A that

Unionists reacted with bitterness. Fanning, however, points out that any sense of victory for Nationalists was “misplaced” because, while the IPP had achieved its long-term goal, it had little to show for it, and its only reason for existence had now in fact evaporated. Equally, the Unionists’ bitterness was misplaced, because, in Fanning’s view, they had already won the concession of the principle of exclusion of at least part of Ulster from the Liberal government, some of whose ministers had supported exclusion since February 1912. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide good evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 4 ([20]–[25])

Answers at this level will reveal a very good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a very good analysis and evaluation of the different interpretations of the outcome of the Home Rule crisis by September 1914. Answers at this level will display a very good understanding of the historical context. The passing of the Third Home Rule Bill into law was in one sense a significant achievement for Redmond and the Irish Parliamentary Party: both interpretations allude to the historic nature of the victory for a party which had fought for the cause for over forty years. However, the previous two years had seen formidable opposition to Home Rule, led by Carson and Bonar Law, and one of the results of this opposition campaign was an Amendment Act promising ‘special treatment’ for Ulster. Interpretation B points out that the Liberal government had accepted the principle of exclusion by the spring of 1914, meaning that the Unionists, rather than Nationalists, were the real victors in September 1914. In contrast, Interpretation A argues that the Unionists felt frustration at the ambiguous nature of the Amendment Act and the resulting uncertainty about whether Asquith would grant exclusion. They had no certainties, whereas Redmond had the certainty of an Act on the statute book to be passed no later than the end of a war which “almost everyone” expected to be of short duration. Interpretation A argues that Carson, like Asquith, was “fortunate” that the war broke out before a Unionist rebellion or civil war erupted. Interpretation B is the only interpretation which refers to the Southern Unionists, who stood to lose most from the Home Rule Bill. Candidates may challenge Laffan’s assertion in interpretation A that Home Rule was “the law of the land”, pointing to the fateful Suspensory Act. Candidates may challenge Interpretation B by suggesting that, despite Fanning’s assertion, Ulster Unionists could not be confident of partition in September 1914. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide very good evidence in support of their judgement.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[25]

25

- 3 (a) “The impact of the First World War on Ireland was the most important cause of the Easter Rising of 1916.” To what extent would you accept this verdict?

This question targets AO1: the candidate’s ability to 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.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement. Answers at this level will demonstrate superficial understanding. There may be some coverage of the causes of the Easter Rising with little or no reference to the question. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement. The response will have some supporting evidence. For example, there may be a limited focus on the causes of the Easter Rising without the argument being developed in order to answer the question directly. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgements are developed and substantiated. Candidates may take the proposition at close to face value, providing a good analysis of how the impact of the First World War on Ireland contributed to the Easter Rising, but not fully address additional causes. The First World War presented an opportunity to stage a rising because it created a political vacuum, with Home Rule now on the statute book but indefinitely postponed. The war lasted much longer than had been expected and by 1916 many were disillusioned with it and by the treatment of nationalist soldiers by Lord Kitchener. Redmond’s role in the war was weakened when he turned down a seat in the wartime coalition; his party lost its sense of direction and some people regarded his role as reduced to acting as a ‘recruiting sergeant’ for the British army. His Woodenbridge speech of 1914 split the Irish Volunteers, allowing the Irish Republican Brotherhood leadership to infiltrate the smaller group led by Eoin MacNeill. These radicals attempted to exploit the political

vacuum, believing that ‘England’s difficulty was Ireland’s opportunity’. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and concisely. Explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgements are very well developed and substantiated.

Level 4 candidates will not solely address the First World War, but also other factors causing the Easter Rising. They may also observe that the Rising was carried out by ‘a minority within a minority’. The role of the key rebel leaders, such as Thomas Clarke, Sean MacDermott and Patrick Pearse, was crucial in the planning and implementation of the Rising. Answers may reflect upon the ideology of revolt expressed by these individuals, as well as the contribution of other leaders such as James Connolly. Connolly was enlisted as the sixth member of the IRB Military Council partly because of his role as leader of the Irish Citizens’ Army, a socialist movement of around 200 people. Clarke, the main instigator of the Rising, had been a prominent Fenian and provided a direct link to the physical force separatist tradition. Pearse, a romantic visionary and poet, articulated a ‘blood sacrifice’ ideology which placed emphasis on the importance of bloodshed and martyrdom. In his call to arms, Pearse referenced ‘Carsonism’ and the arming of the Ulster Volunteers. The fact that the rebels launched the Rising even after serious setbacks, such as MacNeill’s countermanding the order for the Volunteers to mobilise and the failure of Casement’s gun smuggling operation, showed their strong determination to rebel. New Nationalism can be regarded as another cause of the Rising. The Gaelic Revival had influenced a generation of young people – including men such as Pearse, Plunkett and Ceannt – by promoting ideals of Irish cultural nationalism. A further cause of the Rising could be seen as the ineptitude and failure of British intelligence, which failed to thwart the rebels’ plans. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [20]

20

- (b) “The superior negotiating skills of the British delegation prevented Sinn Féin from achieving a republic in the Anglo-Irish Treaty talks of 1921.” How far would you agree with this statement?

This question targets AO1: the candidate’s ability to 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.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement. Answers at this level will demonstrate superficial understanding. There may be some coverage of the negotiation of the Anglo–Irish Treaty with little or no reference to the question. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgement. The response will have some supporting evidence. For example, there may be a limited focus on the negotiating skills of the British delegation without the argument being developed in order to answer the question directly. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgements are developed and substantiated. Candidates may take the proposition at close to face value, providing a reasonably full analysis of how superior British negotiating skills prevented Sinn Féin from achieving a republic, but not fully address the additional reasons for their failure. Of the British delegation, Lloyd George had excellent negotiating experience, while the others, Chamberlain, Birkenhead and Churchill, also had extensive political experience. The sub-conferencing tactic weakened the Irish side and caused suspicion and mistrust to grow among the Sinn Féin representatives. Lloyd George cultivated a relationship with Griffith, who was more willing than the others to compromise, and perhaps more gullible. Realising that partition was a weak spot, Lloyd George deftly removed it from the equation by securing Griffith's consent to a Boundary Commission. The British delegation were united and well-organised, contrasting with the divided Irish team, who lacked their more politically experienced leader, de Valera, and were confused by his concept of external association. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and concisely. Explanation, analysis, evaluation and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. Level 4 candidates will not only assess the strengths of the British negotiating

team, but also assess the skills of the Sinn Féin negotiators. The Sinn Féin delegates were divided, with Erskine Childers' main role being to act as a spy for de Valera. The team lacked authority due to de Valera's absence. Contradictory instructions from de Valera and the Dáil meant that there was confusion over whether the Irish negotiating team had full powers to sign a Treaty without prior consent from Dublin. The Irish placed themselves at a disadvantage early on by not having a counter-document ready to respond to the British team's opening proposal of dominion status. By the time the counter-proposals were submitted, the Irish had already given up on the term 'republic', asking instead for 'association' status within the Empire. As a military man, Collins keenly felt his lack of experience in the finer political skills, yet he managed to obtain significant concessions in fiscal and financial affairs. However, the main reason why a republic was not gained was that it was never a realistic prospect. The IRA campaign of violence to win a republic had failed. De Valera, on his visits to London in July 1921, had been made aware by Lloyd George that a republic was not achievable. Despite this, he agreed to engage in new negotiations in September. Controversially, he decided not to attend himself, arguably because he knew a compromise must be made. Thus, it was ultimately irrelevant to discuss the issue of a republic, as it had been forfeited when the truce was signed. Top level answers will reflect on the various reasons why Sinn Féin failed to secure a republic in the Treaty negotiations. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[20]

Option 4

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

20

80

