



Rewarding Learning

**ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
2022 RESERVE SERIES**

History

Assessment Unit A2 2

Historical Investigations and Interpretations

[AHY21]

THURSDAY 23 JUNE, MORNING

**MARK
SCHEME**

General Marking Instructions

Introduction

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

Assessment objectives

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

Candidates 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 candidates' responses

In marking the examination papers, examiners 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 candidates may produce. In the event of unanticipated answers, examiners are expected to use their professional judgement to assess the validity of answers. If an answer is particularly problematic, then examiners should seek the guidance of the Supervising Examiner.

Positive marking

Examiners are encouraged to be positive in their marking, giving appropriate credit for what candidates know, understand and can do rather than penalising candidates for errors or omissions. Examiners 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 candidates 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, examiners 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, examiners are expected to use their professional judgement.

The following guidance is provided to assist examiners.

- **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 candidates' 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, examiners should refer to the more detailed guidance provided below:

Level 1 (Basic): The candidate 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 candidate 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 candidate 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 candidate 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.

COVID-19 Context

Given the unprecedented circumstances presented by the COVID-19 public health crisis, senior examiners, under the instruction of CCEA awarding organisation, are required to train assistant examiners to apply the mark scheme in case of disrupted learning and lost teaching time. The interpretation and intended application of the mark scheme for this examination series will be communicated through the standardising meeting by the Chief or Principal Examiner and will be monitored through the supervision period. This paragraph will apply to examination series in 2021–2022 only.

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 Puritan threat 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 the work of Puritan delegates to a meeting of the Convocation of the Church of England.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the value of the source, using the content more fully. Source 1 details Six Articles to reform the Church which have been drafted by Puritan delegates. These include proposed changes to how baptism is performed and a ban on organ music in church.

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 note that, while the authors of Source 1 are not identified, the presentation of such proposals to a meeting of the Convocation of the Church of England is proof not only that Puritanism existed within the Church but that it was prepared to assert itself. While the programme of proposed reform may comprise only six articles, the changes outlined are significant and reflect Puritan thinking at that time. For example, Article 1 states that the only “holy days” in the Church calendar should be confined to all Sundays and the days associated with Christ’s own life, such as Christmas, Good Friday and Easter Sunday. The banning of all other Church holidays would, from the Puritan perspective, “cleanse” the Church of some of its remaining Catholic features, such as the veneration of saints and particularly the Virgin Mary.

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 lists the Six Articles presented to the meeting of the Convocation of the Church of England in 1563. While it might be considered quite moderate in comparison to later Puritan demands, the fact that it occurs early in the reign of Elizabeth I, and just four years after the Elizabethan Church Settlement of 1559, is an indication both that Puritans were dissatisfied with that settlement and that they did not regard it as the final word on the subject. For those who had experienced exile on the

continent and exposure to Calvinism (such as Sir Francis Walsingham), the Church of England still needed to be purged of many vestiges of Catholicism. This is seen, for example, in the reference in Article 3 to the sign of the cross in baptism, and the reference in Article 5 to the wearing of the surplice. A limitation of the source might be its early date (Elizabeth I would rule for another 40 years), in that it cannot provide information on how Puritanism developed, or indeed *if* it did develop, after this point. Nonetheless, such a limitation does not seriously detract from the value of the proof presented here that the Puritans had a coherent programme and were not a group whose threat to the Church and the Queen could easily be dismissed.

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 Puritans presented a serious threat to Elizabeth I and the Church of England?

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 Puritans presented a serious threat to Elizabeth I and the Church of England. 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 Puritans presented a serious threat to Elizabeth I and the Church of England. Candidates might note that Source 1, the Six Articles presented to a meeting of the Convocation of the Church of England, provides evidence to suggest that the Puritans have prepared a programme of religious reform, while Source 2 shows that the Queen is determined to maintain control of the Church of England.

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 interpret them in relation to their historical context. Responses at this level may perhaps confine their analysis to concurring with the proposition. For example, the Six Articles presented to the Convocation of the Church of England in 1563 (Source 1) indicate a number of changes that Puritan members of the Church wish to see introduced in order to remove “superstition” from religious practice, a coded reference to Catholic features that still remain. Even Article 2 is in this vein, since Catholic clergy would have faced the eastern end of a church or have their backs towards a congregation when celebrating Mass. In Source 2, we get a strong sense of the Queen’s exasperation and frustration with those – including apparently her Archbishop of Canterbury – who either fail to uphold the laws governing religion or who deliberately break the law by operating without the sanction of the Church of England. If the Six Articles (Source 1) are evidence of a Puritan threat to Elizabeth I, and specifically her Church Settlement, early in her reign (1563), then the Queen’s letter to Edmund Grindal (Source 2), written 14 years later, can be seen as proof that Puritanism was indeed a serious threat to the Established Church and one that was not restricted to the early years of Elizabeth I’s reign.

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, employing both sources. Puritanism presented a threat to the Elizabethan Church Settlement of 1559 and the Queen was determined to resist any attempt to undermine that settlement, for on this foundation, she believed, rested the peace and security of her realm. Puritans, however, believed that the English Reformation was incomplete and Source 1 presents strong evidence to support this view, as six proposed reforms are laid before a meeting of the Convocation of the Church of England, the ecclesiastical equivalent of Parliament. For those who had been in exile on the continent during the previous reign and who had been exposed to Calvinist doctrine and teaching, the Church of England retained many Catholic features which the Puritan delegates now sought to remove, such as the veneration of saints (indirectly dealt with in Article 1 of the Six Articles) and the sign of the cross (Article 3). The Six Articles were narrowly defeated in the Convocation of 1563, but, although the established religious order emerged intact from the threat, it had been a close call and an indication of further battles to come. In Source 2, dated 14 years after the defeat of the Six Articles, Puritanism clearly remains very much a “live” issue, and one about which Elizabeth I’s patience is clearly beginning to be stretched to its limits. The ongoing and illegal activity of unlicensed preaching and holding of unauthorised services are regarded by the Queen as likely to stir up malcontents and weaken religious uniformity. The Elizabethan Church Settlement had been deliberately designed to seek a middle way between Catholicism and Protestantism that could unite her people and prevent any revival of the religious controversy and turmoil which had plagued England under previous Tudor monarchs, or even worse, a descent into religious war as seen elsewhere in Europe. Elizabeth sought only outward conformity to the Church, not a window “into men’s souls”, but the Puritans presented a very public threat, openly defying the Church of which the Queen was supreme governor. Puritanism may have attracted only a minority following

in the Church, but it had taken root in the populous south and east of England, and in particular in East Anglia and London, the seat of power. Its influence in these areas meant that it had a disproportionate voice in Parliament and Elizabeth as a consequence found the Parliaments of her later reign more fractious and difficult to manage. The Puritan movement may not have had great numbers behind it, but it had some powerful figures at the front, including some senior clergy and officials of state, such as the Earl of Leicester and Sir Francis Walsingham. Elizabeth's rather blunt tone with her Archbishop of Canterbury in Source 2 reflected the fact that Edmund Grindal was on record as approving of unlicensed preaching and prophesying, believing that it helped to advance God's work (he had said as much in an earlier letter to the Queen). He remained obdurate in the face of this latest command from Elizabeth and was consequently suspended as archbishop. And so the undeclared "war" between the Crown and the Puritans continued.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[20]

35

AVAILABLE
MARKS

2 Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.

Using the interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the causes of the Spanish Armada 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 causes of the Spanish Armada but evaluation may be limited. 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 causes of the Spanish Armada. 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, Morgan identifies two paramount causes for the sailing of the Spanish Armada: English interference with Spanish colonial trade, often in the form of piracy, and English support for the Dutch Revolt against their Spanish rulers. On the other hand, Bindoff in Interpretation B sees the Armada as part of a great Counter-Reformation crusade against European Protestantism. 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 causes of the Spanish Armada. Answers at this level will display a good understanding of the historical context. In Interpretation A, Morgan argues that there are two key factors which explain the deterioration of Anglo-Spanish relations to the point where Philip II dispatches the Spanish Armada to invade England in 1588; both of those factors involve indirect English attacks on the Spanish Empire. One is the increasing frequency with which English ships begin to interfere with Spain's colonial trade, in particular the movement of precious metals from its empire in the Americas to mainland Spain. However, as Morgan implies, there was a fine line between attempts to establish English commercial links with the wider world and outright piracy. Here, from an English perspective, Francis Drake stands out as a rugged defender of the principle of freedom of the seas, while to the Spanish he is the worst of the so-called "freebooters", seeking to enrich himself – and Elizabeth I – at Spain's expense. However, Morgan considers the second factor – English support for the Dutch rebels in 1585 – to be more important.

This is a direct challenge to Spanish control of the Low Countries and is in effect an act of war without a declaration of war on England's part. To sum up, Morgan's case is basically that the Spanish Armada sailed in response to English provocation. In stark contrast, Bindoff in Interpretation B puts the onus on Spain – and its monarch, Philip II, as a would-be champion of the Catholic Counter-Reformation – to explain why Spain waged war against England. In Bindoff's interpretation, the Anglo-Spanish War that was signalled by the sailing of the Armada was simply a battle in the greater European struggle between the forces of Protestantism and Catholicism – a “holy war” to recover England from heresy. The role of the papacy and its agents (such as the Jesuits) is therefore almost as important as that of Philip II himself – but not quite as important, because Bindoff also identifies the desire for conquest and aggrandisement as factors in the King of Spain's calculations. In other words, this was a war Philip II always intended to wage. 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 causes of the Spanish Armada. Answers at this level will display a very good understanding of the historical context. In support of Interpretation A, answers may explore in greater depth the role played by Sir Francis Drake in antagonising the Spanish and the relationship that was formed between Drake and the Queen. For example, in 1577, Drake was secretly commissioned by Elizabeth I to set off on an expedition against the Spanish colonies on the American Pacific coast. Drake duly travelled up the west coast of South America and plundered Spanish ports. If this was piracy, it was seemingly of the state-sponsored variety. In 1587, war with Spain was imminent and Drake entered the port of Cadiz and destroyed 30 of the ships the Spanish were assembling to invade England. Responses may also examine Elizabeth I's decision to support the Dutch Revolt in 1585, a decision over which she had long agonised. Most of her advisers had advocated earlier intervention, but by 1585 the Dutch were in such a beleaguered position that, without foreign assistance, the revolt was almost certain to collapse. Then, as Burghley and Walsingham argued, England would face a much stronger Spain and one which could devote all its resources to an attack on England. Better to run the risk of provoking outright war with Spain now, with the Dutch “second front” still active, than have to face the might of Spain alone. The Queen sent an expedition commanded by the Earl of Leicester to the Netherlands in 1585 and the Dutch fought on, but Philip began to prepare his Armada the following year. In support of Interpretation B, answers may elaborate on both the external and internal Catholic threat to the Elizabethan regime. The Papal Bull referred to by Bindoff was that issued by Pope Pius V on 25 February 1570, which excommunicated the Queen, declared her to be an illegitimate pretender and commanded her subjects not to obey her. Ten years later, the Jesuit mission to England was launched from Rome, and the first priests began to secretly arrive in 1580. Philip II was not a disinterested observer of these developments, and was soon complicit in the “secret war” against Elizabeth I, particularly the Throckmorton Plot of 1583, which led to the dismissal of the Spanish Ambassador Mendoza (and which also involved a number of Jesuit priests), and the Babington Plot of 1586, which sought to place Mary, Queen of Scots on the English throne. The subsequent execution of Mary gave Philip II further cause to wage a holy war against England and Elizabeth I. Both interpretations can be challenged, however. Candidates may challenge Interpretation A on

the grounds that it places too much blame on England – that it is solely due to Elizabeth’s support of English piracy and her decision to back the Dutch rebels that war breaks out – with Spain seen as a victim of initial English aggression. Furthermore, Morgan’s analysis can be criticised as too narrow, identifying only two causes for the war. A possible challenge to Interpretation B is that it omits the event that provided the spark which led to the building and dispatch of the Armada, namely direct English involvement in the Dutch Revolt in 1585. 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]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

25

- 3 (a) To what extent would you accept that any successes Elizabeth I achieved in her reign were due to her personality?

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 any successes Elizabeth I achieved in her reign were due to her personality. 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 any successes Elizabeth I achieved in her reign were due to her personality. For example, there may be a general reference to Elizabeth I's ability to persuade her subjects to pursue a middle path in religion. 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 argue that, from the very beginning of her reign, Elizabeth I used her innate dignity and composure to help restore peace and order to a divided country, notably in the first speech she gave as Queen. Furthermore, the royal "progresses" that the Queen conducted throughout the country were a reflection of both Elizabeth's desire to meet her subjects but also her appreciation that it was important for a monarch to be seen by those subjects and not remain secluded at court. Elizabeth's personality was also an important factor in persuading Parliament and the Church hierarchy to accept the Church Settlement of 1559. 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 may argue that the Queen’s personality served her and her nation well when she faced the greatest challenge of her reign – the Spanish Armada in 1588. It was a crisis in which Elizabeth I’s inspirational leadership emboldened her nation in its hour of peril. This was best demonstrated by the speech she gave to her army at Tilbury on 9 August 1588, as it prepared to face the might of Spain, in which she proclaimed: “I know I have the body but of a weak, feeble woman; but I have the heart and stomach of a king, and of a king of England too.” The defeat of the Spanish Armada also helped to consolidate what was not so much an aspect of Elizabeth’s personality as a myth that she had helped to construct in the course of her reign – that of the Virgin Queen, wedded to no man but rather to the nation. Though even here, Elizabeth displayed astuteness in recognising the inherent weakness of her position as a female ruler in a patriarchal world and the need to compensate for that handicap by building a legend. However, candidates might contend that personality alone cannot account for the successes of Elizabeth’s reign and that another major factor was the role of the Queen’s advisers and state officials. Elizabeth was well served by the likes of Burghley, Walsingham and others, whose experience and dedication she could draw on as she negotiated the challenge of ruling England. Of course, the fact that Elizabeth appreciated the value of such advisers, even when she disagreed with them, reflects well on the Queen. 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]

- (b) How far would you agree that the use of patronage and the formation of factions at Elizabeth I’s court created an efficient system of government?

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 how far the use of patronage and the formation of factions at Elizabeth I’s court created an efficient system of government. 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 how far the use of patronage and the formation of factions at Elizabeth I's court created an efficient system of government. For example, responses may note the role and effectiveness of William Cecil and Robert Dudley, who would both benefit from the Queen's patronage. 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 early years of Elizabeth I's reign were dominated by her use of favourites and their loyalty towards her. She used this to control the court and Parliament, as well as placing selected individuals, such as Cecil and Walsingham, in Parliament to ensure that she maintained control. However, with the use of favourites came opposition and an increase in faction fighting. Answers may mention the tension between the Cecil and Dudley factions. Ultimately, Elizabeth was able to use their loyalty towards her to ensure that this tension was kept to a minimum. 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 in the later years of Elizabeth's reign, increased faction fighting – which had previously been a source of strength for the Crown, due to the Queen's ability to play off one faction against another – now threatened to destabilise the system of government which the Queen now found difficult to manage. This would suggest that she was no longer able to control the government through loyalty alone. At court, the new favourites appeared to be driven by self-interest rather than loyalty to the Queen, best exemplified by the rebellion of the Earl of Essex in 1601. However, the rebellion was easily put down and few offered support for it. Once Essex was removed, the court and government once again appeared to operate efficiently. Robert Cecil had been well tutored in the art of government by his father, Lord Burghley, and, although he was unpopular, he was an efficient administrator, for example in organising the smooth transition of power to James I after Elizabeth's death. Faction fighting

was not unique to the last years of Elizabeth's reign and throughout she had always remained in control. The first half of her reign was dominated by fighting between the Cecil and Dudley factions, but throughout her reign Elizabeth remained in control of her court through the skilful use of patronage. She always used tensions between rivals and rival factions to increase her power, which in turn created a strong political system. 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

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 causes of the Glorious Revolution?

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 reveals that James II has encountered opposition.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the value of the source, using the content more fully. Source 1 argues that, while James II appears to have made progress towards his objectives, he has in fact united the country in opposition to him. His policies have failed and his supporters are divided.

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. In terms of content, the source clearly suggests that James II was an unpopular and incompetent King. Halifax concedes that James appears to have made progress, but reveals to William that the country is in fact united against the King. It is interesting that Halifax feels the need to reassure William on this point, which is perhaps an indication of William's anxiety about developments in England. Halifax points to the campaign to pack Parliament and James II's use of controversial prerogative powers as key factors in generating opposition. He states that they have 'united men against the King'. Halifax also suggests that James II's policies have not only failed but have been counter-productive – 'Everything they do turns back upon them'. Candidates may argue that much of the value of this source lies in its authorship. Halifax was a well-connected political figure, author of the famous 'Letter to a Dissenter' and previously a member of Charles II's Privy Council.

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. The source, written in the final year of James II's reign but before the birth of the Prince of Wales, provides a fascinating insight into the extent of the King's unpopularity. The letter was addressed to William of Orange, who, a few weeks later, decided to invade England. Candidates may speculate that Halifax's motive was to persuade William to act. Candidates will also point out some of the limitations of the source. For example, Halifax is quite vague in his analysis of James II's failure, providing

limited evidence to support his assertions. Contextual knowledge will be introduced to enhance the answer. Halifax had also been dismissed from the Privy Council at the beginning of the reign, and may have been prejudiced against James. However, although opposed to James II's policies, he had opposed the Exclusion Act in the 1680s and might therefore be considered a more objective observer than some. Candidates may provide evidence to support the argument that James II's campaign to pack Parliament had failed by April 1688 or that Dissenters had failed to rally to the King's programme.

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 James II's policies were the only cause of the Glorious Revolution?

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 James II's policies were the only cause of the Glorious Revolution. 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 James II's policies were the only cause of the Glorious Revolution. Source 1 clearly suggests that his policies made him deeply unpopular and united the country against him.

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 interpret them in relation to their historical context. Responses at this level may perhaps confine their analysis to concurring with the proposition. For example, candidates might note that Source 1 states that the policies of James II had 'united men against the King'. The source also reveals that 'every day, people grow more opposed to what the King is trying to impose upon them'. Support for the proposition may also be found in Source 2. Burnet indicates that 'the majority

of the country declared its support for William', which may have been a consequence of James II's divisive policies.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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. Candidates may use Source 1 to highlight James II's deep unpopularity. His policies had clearly failed to win support from any section of English society and had in fact united former rivals – the Whigs and Tories. James had originally sought to work with the Tories, who dominated Parliament in 1685. Relations were initially positive, as Tories were greatly reassured by the King's speech to the Privy Council after the death of Charles II. But relations soured when James began appointing Catholic officers to the English army. Halifax makes mention of James II's 'illegal actions' and 'extraordinary powers' as particular factors in creating opposition to the King. This might refer to any number of actions taken by James II, such as the creation of the Ecclesiastical Commission or the use of the controversial Suspending Power to promulgate the Declaration of Indulgence. Source 2 also suggests that James II was unpopular, although it does not explicitly state that this was a consequence of royal policy; candidates may, however, argue that this is implied. Burnet mentions that James lost support from the majority of the people and that his army was 'not to be trusted'. However, Source 2 places more emphasis on other factors. Burnet focuses on the impact of William's invasion, particularly on James II's nervous state. James does indeed appear to have suffered a psychological collapse in 1688, brought on by the invasion and by the defection of figures such as John Churchill and Princess Anne. Candidates will also refer to other factors that contributed to the Glorious Revolution, such as the birth of the Prince of Wales or Louis XIV's actions in 1688.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[20]

35

2 Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.

Using both interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the outcome of the Battle of the Boyne 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 Battle of the Boyne. 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 Battle of the Boyne. 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 argues that superior Williamite equipment and leadership led to Jacobite defeat. In Interpretation B, Petrie argues that William's leadership was not particularly impressive. He attributes the outcome to Jacobite error and William's superior numbers. 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 Battle of the Boyne. Answers at this level will display a good understanding of the historical context. Interpretation A emphasises the quality of William's army. Candidates might develop this with reference to the experience and expertise of individual units, such as the Dutch Blue Guards, or the superiority of the flintlock musket. Petrie, in contrast, highlights the errors made by James II and Lauzun. He argues that Tyrconnell provided good leadership, praises the role of the Irish cavalry and criticises William for allowing the Jacobites to retreat in good order. 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 Battle of the Boyne. Answers at this level will display a very good understanding of the historical context. Both interpretations agree that James

II erred in choosing to fight at the Boyne. Candidates may develop this with reference to the river's easy fordability and the opportunity it provided for James to be outflanked. The French preferred to abandon Dublin and withdraw behind the Shannon for this reason. Candidates may, however, challenge the assertion, as, had James not made a stand at the Boyne, he would have conceded Dublin to William without a fight, which would have been a shattering blow to Jacobite morale. Interpretation A also highlights the inferiority of the Jacobite forces. Candidates may refer to the losses suffered at Londonderry or may point out that many of Tyrconnell's best-equipped troops had been withdrawn from Ireland to England in 1688. Interpretation B lays heavy emphasis on the decision by James and Lauzun to withdraw the majority of their forces from Oldbridge to prevent William's flanking manoeuvre. This removed James II's strongest forces, including his artillery, from the battle and rendered a Williamite victory close to certain. A possible challenge to Interpretation B is that Petrie is too dismissive of William's leadership. William was highly effective in leading his men and inspiring their confidence. Ultimately, his tactics worked and resulted in James fleeing Ireland and ceding Dublin. 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) “By 1714, the Penal Laws had destroyed the power and status of Catholics in Ireland”. To what extent do you agree with this judgement?

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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 Penal Laws had destroyed the power and status of Catholics in Ireland by 1714. 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 Penal Laws had destroyed the power and status of Catholics in Ireland by 1714. They may refer to the impact of the Penal Laws on Catholic ownership of land or their ability to participate in politics. 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 refer to any number of penal laws passed by the Irish Parliament in the period 1689-1714. The Act to Restrain Foreign Education of 1695, for example, made it illegal for Catholics to teach or send their children overseas for education, which had a great impact on the educational opportunities for Catholics and created an incentive to convert. Legislation passed in 1695 and 1697 also suppressed the observation of Catholic holy days and banished Catholic clergy from Ireland. Candidates may, however, point out that enforcement of penal legislation was inconsistent, and the Catholic faith continued to be practised by the majority of the Irish population. 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 will give a full account of the extent to which the power and status of Catholics had been destroyed by 1714. Despite the Popery Act of 1703, Catholics continued to play an important role in politics. In the west of Ireland, politics was dominated by ‘convert families’, who retained close links to the wider Catholic community. The figures for Catholic land ownership may also be misleading, as many Catholics continued to lease land. As ‘intervening landlords’ or ‘Great Tenants’, they could still direct the votes of the tenants under their control. Finally, many of the laws against Catholic priests and Catholic worship were not consistently enforced, and the Catholic faith continued to be practised. For example, it was reported in 1714 that thousands of Catholics still made an annual pilgrimage to Lough Derg. Enforcement of the Penal Laws tended to intensify during periods of ‘invasion scares’ but be relaxed afterwards. In terms of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, despite bishops having been banished from Ireland under William III, new occupants were in place by the end of Anne’s reign, in defiance of the law. 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 Jacobites failed in the Siege of Derry because of the inadequacy of the foreign support they received.” 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 the reasons for the Jacobite failure in the Siege of Derry. 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 reasons for the Jacobite failure in the Siege of Derry. For example, the Jacobite forces lacked heavy siege artillery and were unable to breach the city's walls. The French could have supplied heavy artillery but did not do so, preferring to keep it on the continent. 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. Louis XIV, James II's main foreign ally, only ever saw the Irish campaign as a distraction. The French sent 6000 infantry to assist James II during the siege, along with much needed money to pay James's Irish army. Louis also sent a number of able commanders – Maumont, Pointis and Rosen. However, what the Jacobites needed most was well-trained men and effective artillery, and Louis XIV was unwilling to contribute enough of either. 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 will provide a full analysis of Jacobite weaknesses and inadequacies and will also address other factors. For example, candidates may emphasise the actions of the Williamite defenders. They engaged repeatedly with the Jacobites and inflicted serious losses. Maumont and Pusignan, two of the most able French officers at Derry, were both killed in skirmishes. Candidates may contrast the inadequate support sent from France with the assistance William III gave to the defenders. In particular, the arrival of the relief fleet in Lough Foyle inspired continued Williamite resistance and eventually broke the siege. Candidates may also refer to the role of Williamite leaders in Derry, who proved themselves effective and energetic commanders. 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

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 activities of the Defenders?

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 by a Church of Ireland minister, Reverend Henry Major, who is describing Defender activities in the Ballyshannon area in 1795.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the value of the source, using the content more fully. Source 1 contains Major's observation that Defender activities are, in his view, anti-Protestant, particularly towards members of the Church of Ireland, in favour of the French and in league with the Presbyterians. Major notes that the Defenders are ready to act "at an hour's notice as soon as the French invade."

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 Reverend Major was in a position of local influence. Answers at this level may acknowledge the extent of Defender organisation, their links with Presbyterians beyond County Donegal, their support for a French invasion and the secrecy surrounding Defender activity by reference to "passwords and rituals" and also a Defender oath, which is reportedly kissed at meetings as a pledge of loyalty. The source is valuable because it highlights Defender activities in the Ballyshannon area in 1795.

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's background as a local Church of Ireland minister with presumed influence. The value of the source lies in its content, which reveals Defender organisation and activities. Reverend Major views the Defenders as sectarian and concludes that their "overall plan seems to be for a general massacre of Church of Ireland members." Candidates at this level will acknowledge the historical context, with increasing levels of sectarianism, the activities of the Peep o' Day Boys and the Defenders, and frustration at the lack of political and

economic progress for Catholics. A limitation of the source lies in the fact that Reverend Major appears to be relying on hearsay. For example, he says “I am told” about the conduct of the Defender meetings. This lack of direct knowledge might reduce his insight and, consequently, the source’s value. The source was written for the attention of the Lord Lieutenant and we can presume that Reverend Major reflects the anxieties of many members of the Church of Ireland, even though the source is limited to the Ballyshannon area and to the summer of 1795.

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 most important aim of the Defenders was to support a French invasion of 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 most important aim of the Defenders was to support a French invasion of 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 most important aim of the Defenders was to support a French invasion of Ireland. Candidates might note that in Source 1 Reverend Major discusses the Defenders’ support for a French invasion, while Source 2 notes that the United Irishmen and Defenders were “ready to rise at a moment’s notice in support of the French.”

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 interpret them in relation to their historical context. Responses at this level may perhaps confine their analysis to concurring with the proposition that the most important aim of the Defenders was to support a French invasion of Ireland. For example, Source

1 shows Reverend Major's belief that the Defenders pledge loyalty "to the French" and will rise up in the event of a French invasion. Reverend Major notes how he believes that a leading Defender figure has gone to France. Candidates will note that in Source 2, William Bird states that both the United Irishmen and the Defenders are conspiring together and are ready to act "at a moment's notice in support of the French." Both sources agree that a French invasion is being sought and is expected.

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 support of the proposition, both Sources 1 and 2 suggest that the Defenders will welcome a French invasion, which would likely support their plans. Candidates may use their wider knowledge to note that there is evidence to suggest that the Defenders saw the opportunities afforded by French assistance even before the United Irishmen did. This prospect became greater after the mission of Reverend William Jackson to Ireland in 1794, Wolfe Tone's subsequent implication in this affair, and his departure from Ireland in June 1795. At this level, candidates should challenge the view that the Defenders' most important aim was to support a French invasion of Ireland. Source 1 identifies the Defenders as a Catholic and "anti-Protestant" society, which was planning – in his view – "a general massacre of Church of Ireland members." Major also notes how the Defenders were meeting with Presbyterians (the United Irishmen) and storing arms in County Antrim. In Source 2, William Bird notes how the Defenders' aim in 1796 was to form an "alliance" with the United Irishmen "against their common enemy, the Orangemen." This co-operation between the United Irishmen and the Defenders is implied in Source 1. The Orange Order had been formed in the aftermath of the Battle of the Diamond near Loughgall, County Armagh, in September 1795 and the activities of the Orangemen since then were regarded as "violent" and provocative. Moreover, Source 2 identifies another Defender aim as swearing Catholic militiamen into their movement, thereby weakening the effectiveness of the military. Bird also states that the Defenders' aims included preparing to rise up in rebellion alongside the increasingly militant United Irishmen, with some members of both movements being "ready to rise at a moment's notice."

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

35

2 Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.

Using the interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the impact of the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam in early 1795 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 impact of the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam in early 1795. 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 impact of the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam in early 1795. 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, Beckett notes that the major impact of Fitzwilliam's recall was the creation of "an atmosphere favourable to rebellious activity", especially among Catholics, and greatly increased recruitment into the United Irishmen and Defenders. In Interpretation B, Lindsay's interpretation is that Fitzwilliam's recall did not bring about an immediate and widespread radicalisation of Irish Catholics. 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 impact of the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam in early 1795. Answers at this level will display a good understanding of the historical context. In Interpretation A, Beckett notes that opinion was transformed by the recall of Fitzwilliam, with Catholic hopes "dashed" and other supporters of reform weakened. The mood was one of "grief" and the prospects for reform by peaceful methods – as espoused by Grattan and the Whigs – were dealt a severe blow. Fitzwilliam's recall to London strengthened the "forces of revolution" by causing "widespread disappointment." By contrast, Interpretation B argues that it would be "misleading" to view the recall of Fitzwilliam as a cause of the immediate radicalisation of Catholics. Lindsay argues that Catholic loyalty to the Crown continued and there was "little reaction" among Catholics to the appearance of a French fleet in Bantry Bay in December 1796. Lindsay's nuanced interpretation is that, while Fitzwilliam's recall was a "landmark for many Catholics", it did not in itself "transform the mass of the Catholic population into revolutionary republicans." 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 impact of the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam in early 1795. In Interpretation A, Beckett regards Fitzwilliam’s recall as a very significant event, dashing the hopes of reform, disappointing Catholics, stimulating huge levels of public discourse and getting the administration of the new Lord Lieutenant, Lord Camden, off to a difficult start. Moreover, Beckett attributes the “atmosphere which was favourable to rebellious activity” to the recall of the Lord Lieutenant, with the United Irishmen and the Defenders seeing an upsurge in recruitment. Interpretation A can be supported by the fact that the United Irishmen moved towards a more radical position, with expectations of reform dashed and the prospects of a French-sponsored rising being enhanced by Wolfe Tone’s departure from Ireland and subsequent mission to Paris. With Grattan and the Whigs in the Irish Parliament becoming marginalised, moderate reform had been blown off course. Interpretation A can be challenged with reference to the fact that, while the recall of Fitzwilliam was a definite setback for Irish Catholics, overall Catholic loyalty to the state was still apparent, with the Catholic hierarchy believing that the best chance of change lay with concessions granted in London. Suspicion of the secularism of the United Irishmen and the experience of the Catholic Church in France during the Revolution made it less likely that all Catholics would become revolutionary. Candidates at this level may acknowledge some common ground between Interpretations A and B: both Beckett and Lindsay acknowledge the significant nature of the episode and note that the conservative interest was strengthened by the Lord Lieutenant’s sacking. Interpretation B challenges the transformational impact of the recall of Fitzwilliam on Catholic opinion, noting that “loyalty to the Crown” continued and Irish Catholics did not react to the appearance of a French fleet off the coast of Ireland with enthusiasm, prompting instead “demonstrations of their loyalty to the King.” Irish Catholics had demonstrated loyalty throughout the eighteenth century and had been rewarded for this with the gradual relaxation of the Penal Laws. Interpretation B is supported by the fact that the hierarchy of the Church remained loyal in 1795 and indeed in the year of the Rebellion in 1798. Lindsay maintains that the main impact of Fitzwilliam’s recall was the appointment of the hard-line Lord Camden as Lord Lieutenant and the effect this had on the government’s Irish policy. Interpretation B can be challenged by the fact that Catholic meetings and pamphlets in the aftermath of Fitzwilliam’s recall were critical of the move. The episode radicalised the Defenders and United Irishmen by suggesting that London – and not just the Ascendancy interest in the Irish Parliament – was obstructive and opposed to reform. A revolutionary alternative, with French assistance, became more likely. Answers at this level will display a very good understanding of the historical context. 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) How far would you agree with the view that the successes of the Patriots in the Irish Parliament between 1779 and 1782 were mainly due to the impact of the American War of Independence on Irish politics?

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 how far the impact of the American War of Independence on Irish politics helped explain Patriot successes in the Irish Parliament between 1779 and 1782. 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 how far the impact of the American War of Independence on Irish politics helped to explain Patriot successes in the Irish Parliament between 1779 and 1782. For example, there may be a general reference to the colonial nationalist ideas associated with the American War of Independence and the sympathy many people in Ireland had with the American cause. There may be a general reference to the impact of the American War of Independence on the Irish economy and the calls for change by Patriot MPs in the Irish Parliament. 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. In support of the proposition, candidates could note how the impact of the American War of Independence on Irish politics helped to explain the successes of the Patriots in the Irish Parliament between 1779 and 1782. Flood, Grattan and Charlemont had taken the opportunity to employ colonial nationalist arguments to criticise Westminster's control of Irish legislation and were critical of the limitations placed on Irish trade, which were exposed during the war, plunging Ireland into a recession. Candidates at this level will

also discuss how the American War of Independence led to the Irish garrison being sent to the American colonies. The subsequent absence of any meaningful defence force in the event of a foreign invasion, which was considered more likely after France entered the American War of Independence on the side of the colonists in 1778, led to the formation of Volunteer companies across Ireland, and especially in Ulster. The Volunteers became a vehicle for political discussion and added significant weight to Patriot arguments in support of free trade and legislative independence, which were granted in 1779 and 1782 respectively. Shows of Volunteer strength, such as that outside the Dublin Parliament in November 1779 and the Dungannon Convention of February 1782, provided extra-parliamentary support for Patriot demands and contributed to their successes between 1779 and 1782. 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 will support the proposition by showing how the impact of the American War of Independence contributed to the successes of the Patriots in the Irish Parliament between 1779 and 1782. The American Revolution provided the ideas by which the political system in Ireland could be challenged, with Patriot MPs highlighting the parallels between America and Ireland in political and economic terms. The Patriots benefited from Volunteer support, with leading MPs such as Henry Grattan and Henry Flood using their Volunteer connections to increase Patriot successes in the Irish Parliament, even attending the House of Commons in Volunteer uniform on occasions. The Volunteers helped to politicise opinion in Ireland and the added weight of public opinion made the Patriot argument more compelling. The proposition can be challenged by candidates acknowledging other factors in explaining the successes of the Patriots in the Irish Parliament. The influence of William Molyneux and Jonathan Swift provided an intellectual framework for the Patriots by highlighting economic injustices and the grievances of both Poyning's Law and the Declaratory Act. The American War of Independence determined the timing of Patriot successes in the Irish Parliament between 1779 and 1782, but their arguments were longstanding. Candidates may also argue that the successes of the Patriots in the Irish Parliament between 1779 and 1782 were only possible because of a change of government in London, with the accession of a new Whig administration led by the Marquess of Rockingham, which was sympathetic to Patriot arguments. 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) “Bad luck was the most important reason for the failure of the Rising led by Robert Emmet in July 1803.” 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 of the reasons for the failure of the Rising of July 1803. 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 that relates to bad luck leading to the failure of the Rising of July 1803. For example, the premature explosion at the Patrick Street arms depot the week before the Rising and the failure of French support to materialise were examples of the bad luck that surrounded the Rising of 1803. 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 extent to which bad luck led to the failure of the Rising of July 1803. Bad luck meant that Emmet’s plans were undermined by factors beyond his control. The explosion at the Patrick Street depot on 16 July deprived Emmet of some of the arms and ammunition needed to carry out a successful Rising. Furthermore, Emmet was unlucky in failing to secure the additional funding for weapons that would have made a difference on the day of the planned Rising. He was also unlucky in that the fuses for his technologically pioneering use of rockets failed to work. Candidates at this level will begin to discuss other factors which contributed to the failure of the Rising. Emmet’s failings included the level of secrecy which, while keeping the plans beyond the knowledge of the authorities, contributed to the low numbers who turned out. Emmet’s decision to send James Hope to Ulster in support of Thomas Russell was perhaps another error. 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 bad luck was the most important reason for the failure of the Rising led by Robert Emmet in July 1803. Bad luck and accidental mishaps such as the Patrick Street explosion, the unreliability of his associates and the reluctance of influential United Irishmen like Michael Dwyer in Wicklow and the men of Kildare to commit fully, combined to undermine the Rising. Emmet had been in France to negotiate support for another Rising and had worked hard to secure the help of 1798 veterans. His secrecy, far from being a reason for failure, meant that the government had precious little intelligence of a rising and bad luck played its part in Emmet’s failure to press home his advantages. Candidates at this level will challenge the proposition, pointing to other factors as more important in explaining the failure of the Rising in July 1803. Despite innovative weaponry such as rockets and hinged pikes, Emmet was unable to take advantage of the government’s lack of effective intelligence about the rising, and the chaotic nature of the events of 23 July was suggestive of poor planning and leadership. The violent and undisciplined actions of the rebels on the night of 23 July, including the murder of Lord Kilwarden and his nephew, can be attributed to Emmet’s poor planning and weak leadership, as was the failure to plan effectively outside of Dublin. Emmet’s decision to send Thomas Russell and James (Jemmy) Hope to Ulster rather than use their skills to support the Rising in Dublin can be seen as something more than just bad luck. Candidates at this level will acknowledge a range of factors which led to the failure of the Rising of 1803, including bad luck, weak leadership and Emmet’s poor planning. 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 opposition to Home Rule in the period 1910–1914?

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 reasons why Andrew Bonar Law and his party were opposed to Home Rule.

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 why Bonar Law and his party opposed Home Rule. They believed that the Liberals were unfit to govern and the Ulster Unionists needed to be protected from the dangers posed by Home Rule. The source also sees Bonar Law reflect on his first year as leader of the Conservative and Unionist Party.

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. The author, Andrew Bonar Law, delivers a powerful speech to the members of the Conservative and Unionist Party. The seriousness of the occasion is underlined by his references to “get rid of His Majesty’s government” and “call upon British troops to crush the Unionist people of Ulster.” Bonar Law outlines some of the reasons why he and other Conservatives oppose Home Rule, including that they saw Home Rule as being packaged to bring self-government to Ireland when in fact its true intention was to suppress the freedoms of the Ulster Unionists. Bonar Law also reflects on his first year as leader of the Conservatives and stresses that “I have succeeded,” in reference to his ambition to unite the party in opposition to Home Rule.

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. Responses may comment that Andrew Bonar Law, a Canadian with Ulster roots, became Conservative leader in 1911 and embarked on a campaign of ‘New Style’ politics which saw him openly defend the right of Ulster Unionists to threaten or even use violence to defend their citizenship within the United Kingdom. The speech was Bonar Law’s address to his party, reflecting on the current situation with regard to the Ulster Crisis and his progress as party leader. In the speech Bonar Law refers to the

“necessity which comes before anything else,” which shows the pressing nature of the crisis and the proactive attitude with which Bonar Law met the challenge. Bonar Law shows his desire to remove the Liberals as the government and contextual knowledge may be used to bring in events such as threatening to hold up the Army Annual Act to force the Liberals into an election on the Home Rule issue. Bonar Law addresses the strength of feeling amongst the Ulster Unionists and stresses that “they are not bluffing.” Candidates may use contextual knowledge such as the rallies at Craigavon and Balmoral, the signing of the Covenant and the establishment of the UVF, as evidence of Ulster Unionist determination to stop Home Rule. Finally, Bonar Law expresses his pleasure at the progress his party had made under his leadership in terms of its unity. This progress may link to overcoming issues such as tariff reform disputes, the impact of the Parliament Act and three successive general election defeats for his party. A limitation of the source is that, because it is dated 1912, it gives no information on Unionist opposition after that point and up to 1914.

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 Unionist opposition to Home Rule was responsible for the crisis over the Third Home Rule Bill?

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 how far Unionist opposition to Home Rule was responsible for the crisis over the Third Home Rule Bill. 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 mention the determination of the Ulster Unionists to stop Home Rule and defend their citizenship within the United Kingdom. Source 2 also suggests that at least one member of the Liberal Government was prepared to compromise.

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 interpret them in relation to their historical context. Responses at this level may perhaps confine their analysis to concurring with the proposition. Both sources highlight the determination of the Ulster Unionists to stop the Third Home Rule Bill. This determination resulted in the Ulster Unionists taking ever greater risks to pressurise the Liberal Government to drop Home Rule and alter it to save Ulster. Rallies, propaganda, the Ulster Covenant, the establishment of the Ulster Volunteer Force and the Larne gun-running are all clear examples of the ‘determination’ of the Ulster Unionists to stop Home Rule. However, while Bonar Law is clear about the determination of Unionists, the Liberals, as represented by Churchill in Source 2, are still attempting to convince Redmond and the Irish Parliamentary Party in August 1914.

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. Source 1 outlines the determination of the Conservatives, under the leadership of Bonar Law, to back the Ulster Unionists in their resistance to Home Rule, even to the point of adopting unconstitutional means. Part of Bonar Law’s justification for such action was his belief that the Liberal Government had acted unconstitutionally and that it was necessary “to get rid of His Majesty’s government, the Liberals.” In Source 2, Churchill, as a Liberal, focuses the blame on the Conservatives when he states that they “hate the government.” However, he also stresses that the Conservatives were pragmatic in their approach to Home Rule when he states, “I do not believe that there is any real feeling against Home Rule in the Conservative and Unionist Party, apart from the Ulster question.” Candidates may point out that the complacency of the Irish Parliamentary Party and Liberals over Ulster resistance, and their refusal to address Ulster concerns, exacerbated the crisis. Redmond’s constant referral to threats of Ulster resistance as ‘bluff’ weakened the resolve of the Liberal Government to act early or aggressively to stop it. Comments made by Bonar Law in Source 1 about the use of the army in Ulster may be linked by candidates to the Curragh Incident. Candidates may also develop the role played by Bonar Law in the crisis as he engaged in inflammatory rhetoric and “New Style” politics, designed to destabilise the situation and trigger another general election.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[20]

35

2 Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.

Using the interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the reasons for the truce in the Anglo-Irish War of 1919–1921 do you find more convincing?

This question targets AO3: the candidates 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 truce in the Anglo-Irish War of 1919–1921. 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 truce in the Anglo-Irish War of 1919–1921. 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 the political difficulties being experienced by the British Government during the Anglo-Irish War and how Sinn Féin's determination allowed it to take advantage of these issues. Interpretation B instead focuses on the military difficulties suffered by both sides, claiming that the IRA was short of men and arms, while the British were unwilling to commit the men necessary to achieve total victory in Ireland. Candidates may identify which of these 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 truce in the Anglo-Irish War of 1919–1921. Answers at this level will display a good understanding of the historical context. Candidates will show some awareness of the political and military pressures faced by the British and Irish in the war. Furthermore, candidates may expand on the view of Interpretation A that the fact that a British Prime Minister was prepared to consider a truce and negotiations represented a breakthrough for Sinn Féin. This may be used by candidates to advance the argument that pressures on the British Government were the main reason for the truce in 1921. Its decision to counter IRA attacks with coercive measures was counterproductive and Lloyd George was actively pursuing a political settlement from the beginning of 1921, a reversal from his position earlier in the conflict when he claimed that the IRA was a murder gang and that it was a policeman's job to deal with it. Interpretation A states that the refusal of Sinn Féin to have anything to do with the Southern Ireland Parliament

set up under the Government of Ireland Act of 1920, showed its determination to consider nothing less than effective independence. Sinn Féin refused to accept the Act because it was not interested in Home Rule or in a settlement that included partition. Its decision to continue with the Anglo-Irish War placed further pressure on the British Government to find a settlement. Interpretation B acknowledges that British public opinion in 1921 was “deeply disturbed” about the violence in Ireland. Kee, however, is more focused on military factors than the political issues that led to the truce in 1921. 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 truce in the Anglo-Irish War of 1919–1921. Answers at this level will display a very good understanding of the historical context. Candidates will show a strong understanding of the key concepts advanced by both Interpretations, namely the military and political pressures faced by both the British and Irish during the conflict. Interpretation A mainly focuses on the political pressures faced by the British Government, while Interpretation B focuses more so on the military pressures faced by both the British and Irish sides. The determination of the British Government to stand up to the IRA was slowly eroded during the conflict and was consistently undermined by its decision to deny the military the means to overcome such a dogged enemy. Instead the British Government allowed the Black and Tans and the Auxiliaries to seize the initiative and engage in violent repression. These actions saw increasing pressure placed on the British Government and pushed Lloyd George into opening talks after the King’s speech at the opening of the Belfast Parliament in 1921. Interpretation A strongly suggests that the establishment of Northern Ireland in 1921 had given the British Government a free hand to open negotiations with Sinn Féin, safe in the knowledge that Ulster was settled and would play no part in the talks. This argument is absent in Interpretation B, which omits the impact of the Government of Ireland Act on the truce in favour of looking at the military issues for both the British and the Irish. It discusses the changing nature of the war and how it impacted on the IRA. 1921 has been described as the ‘Year of Terror’ as both sides became increasingly ruthless in their attempts to secure victory. Candidates may challenge Interpretation A by arguing that Adelman and Byrne state that Northern Ireland was removed from the agenda but this was hardly the case as it became one of the biggest stumbling blocks in agreeing both a truce and a subsequent Treaty. 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) How far would you agree that the success of Sinn Féin in the General Election of 1918 was due to the shortcomings of the Irish Parliamentary Party?

This question targets AO1: the candidates 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 comment on the constant willingness of the Irish Parliamentary Party (IPP) to give the advantage to its political enemies, with the principle of some form of partition having been yielded. 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 how John Redmond's decision to support the British war effort, announced in a speech at Woodenbridge in September 1914, had an impact on the IPP. It may be noted that the drawn-out nature of the war saw the IPP lose focus and influence in Ireland as it waited for Home Rule to be granted. 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 sound analysis of how the shortcomings of the IPP contributed to Sinn Féin's success in the 1918 General Election. For example, Redmond's decision to turn down a place in the Coalition Cabinet was seen as a mistake as his opponents Bonar Law and Carson both took up the offer from Asquith and had influence on government policy. Furthermore, Redmond's support for the war backfired with issues such as Kitchener's decision to treat the Ulster and National Volunteers very differently in terms of their enlistment and the consistent threat of conscription that loomed from 1916 onwards. Redmond's trust in

the British Government can also be seen as a shortcoming and undoubtedly contributed to the IPP's misjudgements in both the Lloyd George talks of 1916 and the Irish Convention of 1917–1918. The IPP's decision to join the anti-conscription campaign in 1918 can also be seen as problematic as it was accused of hypocrisy, having previously backed the war effort. The fact that it was handed leadership of the anti-conscription campaign by the IPP gave Sinn Féin an advantage in the General Election of 1918. Also, the leadership of the IPP seemed out of touch with the emerging generation of young voters. The party failed to field a candidate in more than 20 constituencies in the 1918 General Election. 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 shortcomings of the IPP, but also analyse the other factors behind the success of Sinn Féin. The British Government's clumsy handling of both Home Rule and the Irish contribution to the war effort focused public attention on the IPP's misjudgements. Additionally, the policy of the government after the Easter Rising, with the imposition of martial law, the arrest of many innocent people and the execution of the rebels and the well-known journalist Francis Sheehy-Skeffington, provoked resentment and anti-British sentiment, which in turn reflected badly on the IPP. The government's labelling of the rising as a "Sinn Féin rebellion" raised the profile of the hitherto marginal party, which began to win nationalist support by cleverly exploiting the mistakes of the government, such as the German Plot and the death of Thomas Ashe. Candidates will also acknowledge the role that Sinn Féin played in its own rise with key individuals like Count Plunkett, Michael Collins and Éamon de Valera playing a pivotal role in its by-election successes in 1917 and in the drafting of key electoral promises, such as abstention from Westminster, before the 1918 General Election. Sinn Féin took advantage of British mistakes and tapped into the growing disillusionment amongst the Irish population towards the war and the British Government. 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 poor military tactics of the anti-Treaty forces led to their defeat by the Free State army in the Irish Civil War of 1922–1923." To what extent would you accept this verdict?

This question targets AO1: the candidates 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 military tactics of the anti-Treaty forces during the Irish Civil War. 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 limited focus on the poor military tactics of the anti-Treaty forces, with some comment on the seizure of the Four Courts, de Valera's 'pact' with Collins and the guerrilla phase of the Irish Civil War. 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. Answers may focus on a range of tactics used by the participants in the Irish Civil War. The IRA response to the Treaty was confused. Internal wrangling continued - a majority of the GHQ staff were pro-Treaty, whilst many of the units in the south and west were staunchly anti-Treaty. The anti-Treaty IRA was far from united – although Liam Lynch had been selected as Chief of Staff, there was also a more extreme faction led by Rory O'Connor. It was O'Connor who led the seizure of the Four Courts in April 1922, as a direct challenge to the Provisional Government. O'Connor's refusal to leave the Four Courts in June 1922, together with pressure from the British, ultimately forced Collins to launch an attack. By late 1922, the Irish Civil War had degenerated into a guerrilla campaign, with atrocities committed by both sides. 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. There will be a full explanation of the tactics of the anti-Treaty forces and the Free State army, as well as a balanced assessment of the extent to which the poor military tactics of the anti-Treaty forces led to a victory for the Free State army. There were clear splits within the anti-Treaty IRA forces, and as late as 18 June 1922, a majority supported a motion by Tom Barry to declare war on Britain. Having deposed Liam Lynch as Chief of Staff, these militants returned to the Four Courts. The military tactics employed by anti-Treaty forces in taking up fixed positions in Dublin in June 1922 replicated those of the rebels of 1916; such tactics were easily defeated by the Free State forces. Moreover, the execution of leading anti-Treaty IRA leaders, including Liam Mellows and Rory O'Connor, proved decisive. On balance, the anti-Treaty IRA forces were probably more numerous and better armed than Free State government forces at the outset of the Civil War. Yet, by July 1922 Collins' takeover of the command of the Free State army and its success in Munster proved pivotal. The Civil War developed into a phase of guerrilla warfare and atrocities. These included the murder of the father of Kevin O'Higgins and Free State TD Sean Hales by anti-Treaty forces. In total, the Free State government executed 77 anti-Treaty IRA men, including Erskine Childers. This had a demoralising impact on anti-Treaty IRA forces. By early 1923 it was clear that the anti-Treaty forces had no prospect of success. De Valera's plea to end the campaign went unheeded by Liam Lynch, the anti-Treaty IRA leader. It was only following the death of Lynch, and under the new leadership of Frank Aiken, that the anti-Treaty forces suspended their campaign in May 1923. Top level responses should reflect on other factors which contributed to the success of the Free State army by 1923. The outcome of the Treaty election of June 1922 underlines the extent of public support for pro-Treaty candidates. The special powers conferred by the Third Dáil to the Free State government in the Public Safety Bill of September 1922 may be mentioned, for example, the right to set up army courts and execute people carrying firearms. 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

Option 4

80

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**