

Commentary on candidate evidence

Candidate 1

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each element of the coursework assessment task.

Dissertation title: Does Prince Charles Edward Stuart bear the chief responsibility for the failure of the '45?

Structure (overall structure, introduction and conclusion

The candidate was awarded **credit in the 40-44 mark range** because:

Introduction

There is a relevant introduction with main interpretations outlined. It also includes an acknowledgement of relevant historians, an outline of the major factors to be addressed and a suggested line of argument.

Overall structure

There is a sound structure which supports the logical progression of the argument in which sections are demarcated into specific content based chapters which relate to relevant issues and sub-issues.

Conclusion

A well written, compelling conclusion which makes a definitive judgement on the question based upon synthesis and the evaluation of the core concepts.

Thoroughness/ relevance of information and approach

The candidate was awarded **credit in the 40-44 mark range** because the dissertation demonstrates a consistent width and depth of research which reflects a formidable grasp of the relevant content.

Quality paragraphs which feature well worked and insightful evidence feature throughout the dissertation. Evidence is clearly linked to analysis, for example when analysing the competence of Charles's military leadership:

'Indeed Charles lacked any great military experience...It would not be unreasonable to suggest that this lack of military awareness put his army in a weak position...indeed Mackie states "his officers were delusional and despondent. Some of the highlanders had deserted when the border was crossed.'

Analysis, evaluation and line of argument

The candidate was awarded **credit in the 40-44 mark range** because throughout the dissertation there was a firm grasp of the evaluative aims of the question and a very assured and consistent control of the argument.

A line of argument is augmented effectively by the use of sub-conclusions, which are effective in linking argument to evaluation. For example in concluding the candidate's first chapter focused on Charles's leadership the dissertation states:

'Had Charles listened to the advice of his highly experienced and able officials and shown some leadership to see a plan through successfully, he may have been able to lead a more effective threatening Jacobite force at both Culloden and throughout the 1745 rising. Therefore it was his leadership that was to a substantially large degree the reason for the rising's failure.'

Historical sources/interpretations

The candidate was awarded **credit in the 40-44 mark range** because the dissertation consistently demonstrates a sound knowledge and understanding of historians' interpretations and arguments, which enhances the evidence used, particularly in relation to both analysis and interpretation of context. For example, when seeking to highlight the role of European support to the ultimate failure of the Jacobite cause the candidate writes:

'Indeed, as McLynn puts it, 'Louis XV genuinely had a soft spot for the Pretenders and would have liked to have seen them on the throne of the United Kingdom – but restoration of the exiles required a unique concatenation of contingent circumstances from a major power like France which never happened'

A comprehensive bibliography is backed up by numerous examples of accurate historiography and comprehensive footnotes.

The candidate ensures reference is made to primary source material by quoting the Duke of Cumberland's correspondence:

"all accounts agree that they cannot assemble all their clans"