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General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate’s response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate’s response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:
  
  i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear

  ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter

  iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.
GCE History Marking Guidance

Marking of Questions: Levels of Response
The mark scheme provides an indication of the sorts of answer that might be found at different levels. The exemplification of content within these levels is not complete. It is intended as a guide and it will be necessary, therefore, for examiners to use their professional judgement in deciding both at which level a question has been answered and how effectively points have been sustained. Candidates should always be rewarded according to the quality of thought expressed in their answer and not solely according to the amount of knowledge conveyed. However candidates with only a superficial knowledge will be unable to develop or sustain points sufficiently to move to higher levels.

In assessing the quality of thought, consider whether the answer:

(i) is relevant to the question and is explicitly related to the question’s terms
(ii) argues a case, when requested to do so
(iii) is able to make the various distinctions required by the question
(iv) has responded to all the various elements in the question
(v) where required, explains, analyses, discusses, assesses, and deploys knowledge of the syllabus content appropriately, rather than simply narrates.

Examiners should award marks both between and within levels according to the above criteria. This should be done in conjunction with the levels of response indicated in the mark schemes for particular questions.

At the end of each answer, examiners should look back on the answer as a whole in the light of these general criteria in order to ensure that the total mark reflects their overall impression of the answer’s worth.

Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level
The first stage is to decide the overall level and then whether the work represents high, mid or low performance within the level. The overall level will be determined by the candidate’s ability to focus on the question set, displaying the appropriate conceptual grasp. Within any one piece of work there may well be evidence of work at two, or even three levels. One stronger passage at Level 4 would not by itself merit a Level 4 award - but it would be evidence to support a high Level 3 award - unless there were also substantial weaknesses in other areas.

Assessing Quality of Written Communication
QoWC will have a bearing if the QoWC is inconsistent with the communication descriptor for the level in which the candidate’s answer falls. If, for example, a candidate's history response displays mid Level 3 criteria but fits the Level 2 QoWC descriptors, it will require a move down within the level.
### Unit 1: Generic Level Descriptors

**Target: AO1a and AO1b (13%)**

(30 marks)

Essay - to present historical explanations and reach a judgement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | 1-6  | Candidates will produce mostly simple statements. These will be supported by limited factual material which has some accuracy and relevance, although not directed at the focus of the question. The material will be mostly generalised. There will be few, if any, links between the simple statements.  
**Low Level 1: 1-2 marks**  
The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.  
**Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks**  
As per descriptor  
**High Level 1: 5-6 marks**  
The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 1.  
The writing may have limited coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present. |
| 2     | 7-12 | Candidates will produce a series of simple statements supported by some accurate and relevant factual material. The analytical focus will be mostly implicit and there are likely to be only limited links between the simple statements. Material is unlikely to be developed very far.  
**Low Level 2: 7-8 marks**  
The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.  
**Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks**  
As per descriptor  
**High Level 2: 11-12 marks**  
The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2.  
The writing will have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. Some of the skills needed to produce effective writing will be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3     | 13-18 | Candidates' answers will attempt analysis and will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus. Factual material will be mostly accurate but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor.  
Low Level 3: 13-14 marks  
The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.  
Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks  
As per descriptor  
High Level 3: 17-18 marks  
The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 3.  

The writing will be coherent in places but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. Only some of the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are likely to be present. Syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present. |
| 4     | 19-24 | Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. The selection of material may lack balance in places.  
Low Level 4: 19-20 marks  
The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.  
Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks  
As per descriptor  
High Level 4: 23-24 marks  
The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 4.  

The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes may not be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing but there may be passages which lack clarity or coherence. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors. |
Candidates offer an analytical response which directly addresses the focus of the question and which demonstrates explicit understanding of the key issues contained in it. It will be broadly balanced in its treatment of these key issues. The analysis will be supported by accurate, relevant and appropriately selected which demonstrates some range and depth.

**Low Level 5: 25-26 marks**
The qualities of Level 5 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.

**Mid Level 5: 27-28 marks**
As per descriptor

**High Level 5: 29-30 marks**
The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 5.

The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce convincing extended writing will be in place.

**Unit 1 Assessment Grid**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>AO1a and b Marks</th>
<th>Total marks for question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q (a) or (b)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q (a) or (b)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Marks</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Weighting</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*

**Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication**
Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitive, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The question is focused on the causes of the German Reformation, and the extent to which it was caused by humanist criticisms of the Catholic Church.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In considering the stated factor, answers may note that humanists were concerned with studying Biblical texts which were as close to the originals as possible. Erasmus specialised in New Testament study, and concluded that many teachings and practices promoted by the Catholic Church were based on faulty translations in the Vulgate edition. In 1516 he published an accurate edition of the Greek New Testament, and was at the forefront of the demands for reform. Although Erasmus and other humanists contributed to the debate on reform, they were mostly prepared to work for change within rather than outside the Catholic Church. Overall, the humanists were responsible for the development of a climate conducive to reform in the years before 1517.

Other factors which contributed to the outbreak of the German Reformation include the scandal over indulgences caused by Tetzel's activities; long-standing abuses within the papal court, and papal taxation within Germany; the poor quality of the German parish clergy and widespread absenteeism; and Luther's 95 Theses, issued in 1517. The role of the printing press in the rapid spread of Luther's ideas may also be considered.

Answers at **Level 5** will have a secure focus on the question, will address humanist criticisms along with some other relevant factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At **Level 4** candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. **Level 3** answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering abuses within the German church. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At **Level 2** will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. **Level 1** responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.
The question is focused on the spread of Lutheranism in the years after the Diet of Worms in 1521, and the extent to which the absence of a strong central government for the Holy Roman Empire was responsible for that process.

In considering the stated factor, answers may note that Charles V exercised very little power within Germany, where power was shared between the Imperial Diet and the princely states. His attempts to suppress Lutheranism thus depended on the cooperation of the princes, which was not assured after some of them defected to Lutheranism in the 1520s, won over by Luther’s conservative religious and social teaching. The weakness of imperial power was shown dramatically by the formation of the Schmalkaldic League in 1531, dedicated to the defence of Lutheranism; henceforth the German Reformation could only be defeated on the battlefield, as shown at Mühlberg in 1547.

Other factors which allowed for the spread of Lutheranism include the popular response to Luther’s reforms; the role of trade routes and towns; and Charles' failure to concentrate his attention on Lutheranism in the 1520s because of other matters which required his attention outside Germany. The role of the printing press, exemplified by the Loci Communes of 1521, the German New Testament, and the use of woodcuts, may also be addressed.

Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will address the absence of a strong central government for the Empire along with some other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering the role of the princes. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.
### Question 3

The question is focused on the decisions made at the Council of Trent (1545-63) and the extent to which the Council responded effectively to the Protestant challenge.

Answers may focus on the three key areas of conflict; doctrine; discipline; and the Papacy. Trent left Catholic doctrines unchanged in their fundamentals. Luther’s beliefs on the Bible and on justification by faith alone were countered with the traditional Catholic beliefs on scripture and tradition, and on the importance of the seven sacraments and good works in achieving salvation. Thus the doctrinal dividing lines between Catholics and Protestants were sharply defined. There were widespread disciplinary reforms aimed at the reform of abuses highlighted by the Protestant challenge. The role of bishops and priests was clarified, and provision was made for improving the education of the parish priests. Some steps were taken to end the practice of non-residency, though these were not strongly enforced at first. While the position of the papacy was not addressed directly, Protestant attempts made at the second session to place general councils above the pope were snubbed. This, coupled with the decision to allow the pope to decide on the reform of the catechism, missal and breviary, served to enhance papal power rather than diminish it. Taken together, the Council's decisions were instrumental in renewing the Catholic Church, and featured prominently in the Counter-Reformation.

Answers at **Level 5** will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the extent to which Trent was successful in responding to the Protestant challenge, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At **Level 4** candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. For example, Hastings is likely to be considered in more detail than Stamford Bridge. **Level 3** answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering some of the Council's decrees. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At **Level 2** will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. **Level 1** responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The question is focused on the decisions made at the Council of Trent (1545-63) and the extent to which the Council responded effectively to the Protestant challenge.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The question is focused on the Counter-Reformation, and the extent to which the revival of the power of the Papacy was the most important consequence of the Counter-Reformation.

In considering the revival of Papal power answers may note that Papal corruption was one of the factors behind Luther’s challenge in the early 16th century. However, Paul III and his successors carried out a policy of reform aimed at responding to the Protestant attack. Paul III summoned both the Consilium of 1536-37 and the first session of Trent in 1545 to deal with challenges to the Church. Although there were some attempts at Trent to declare the supremacy of a General Council over the Papacy, these demands came to nothing, and the Papacy was strengthened as a result. Pius V implemented the decisions of Trent, along with the reform of the missal and breviary, while his successors to 1600 continued the revival in the power and prestige of the Papacy.

In considering other features of the Counter-Reformation candidates may refer to matters such as: the educational and spiritual influence of the Jesuits, especially within Germany; the influence of various European rulers; and the divisions within Protestantism such as Lutheranism and Calvinism.

Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will address Papal power and other consequences of the Counter-Reformation, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by noting the role of the Jesuits. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.
The question is focused on Spanish government in the Netherlands, and the extent to which it was responsible for the outbreak of the Dutch revolt of 1572.

In considering the stated factor answers may note that Philip II’s rule in the years 1555-59 was a time of growing tensions between the king and the Dutch nobility. Philip’s centralisation policy offended against traditional rule, while his religious policies went counter to the usual policy of toleration. Margaret of Parma also had difficulty in working with the nobility as she was instructed to maintain the centralisation of government. Alba’s rule from 1565 was very unpopular. The nobility were dismayed by the Council of Troubles’ attacks on heresy, and there was widespread opposition to the Tenth Penny, which was illegally imposed in 1572. These actions persuaded many, especially in the northern towns, to give their support to the Sea Beggars, and the intervention of William of Orange in 1572.

Other relevant factors include the strongly Catholic stance taken by Philip II, notably on the bishoprics and the Tridentine decrees: the introduction of the Inquisition; and the marginalisation of the Dutch grandees, who were deeply offended by the actions of the Consulta.

Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider Spanish rule and some other relevant factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering the reign of Philip II. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.
The question is focused on the success of the northern provinces from 1584, and the significance of effective Dutch leadership in contributing to that success.

In considering the stated factor, answers may note that William the Silent had provided powerful and charismatic leadership for many years, and his assassination in 1584 might have proved disastrous for the northern provinces. However, Maurice of Nassau proved equal to his tasks as Stadtholder and leader of the armed forces. Military reorganisation created a strong fighting force which was used effectively in the victories at Turnhout and Nieuwpoort, and in manning new border forts. Maurice was also instrumental in the negotiations which led to the peace of 1609.

Other relevant factors may include the political leadership provided by Oldenbarnevelt which influenced the States General and the overall prestige of the republic. Spain’s endemic economic and political problems were significant. Philip II’s attention was diverted from the Netherlands to matters such as the Moriscos revolt of 1568 and his growing inability to fund military forces in the Netherlands; the latter contributed to Spain’s bankruptcy in 1596. Both Philip II and Philip III had to tackle problems elsewhere, including England, France and Portugal, all of which were a significant drain on Spain’s economic and military resources. In contrast, the founding of the Dutch East India Company reflected on the growing economic power of the republic.

Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider Dutch leadership and other relevant factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering the role of Maurice of Nassau. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7               | The question is focused on the persecution of witches in the years c1580-c1650, and on the extent to which social pressures were responsible for triggering that persecution. Examiners should note that a study of this nature, with a broad spatial as well as temporal focus, relies on the study of particular cases in the context of wider trends.  

In considering the stated factor, answers may note that an important social change was the growing number of unmarried or widowed women of all ages. Wars throughout the period reduced the number of men available for marriage, and the closure of nunneries during and after the Reformation removed a traditional haven for single young women. Other factors which triggered the persecution of witches include significant changes in the patterns of economic life. Wars and civil conflicts cause high inflation and a consequent fall in the general standard of living. There is also evidence of population saturation in much of Europe.  

In considering other factors which led to the persecution of witches, candidates may note the dissemination of works of literature through the growth of printing; the Thirty Years War and lesser conflicts; and the impact of religious change.  

Answers at **Level 5** will have a secure focus on the question, will address social conditions along with some other relevant factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At **Level 4** candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. **Level 3** answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering the stereotypical view of the witch. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At **Level 2** will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. **Level 1** responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked. | 30   |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The question is focused on the frequency of witch trials during the period c1580-c1650, and the extent to which prominent individuals were responsible for that frequency. Examiners should note that a study of this nature, with a broad spatial as well as temporal focus, relies on the study of particular cases in the context of wider trends. Three individuals are named in the clarification of content. One of the most intense persecutions of witches, including the notorious North Berwick witch trials, took place in Scotland under James VI, the author of Daemonologie. His influence as James I of England was felt in the witchcraft law of 1604, though this led to a reduction in the extent and number of witch trials. Matthew Hopkins capitalised on the disorder caused by the English Civil War by carrying out extensive persecution in East Anglia in 1644-45. Disputes between the Abbot of Fulda and his opponents enabled Balthasar Nuss to instigate an ugly witchhunt in 1603-06, which saw the execution of 250 people. Other prominent individuals include Ferdinand von Bayern in Electoral Cologne (3000 victims) and Christian IV of Denmark. Examiners should note that answers which deal exclusively with the role of prominent individuals will not be providing a balanced answer, and are unlikely to get beyond mid Level 4. In considering other factors which promoted the frequency of witch trials, candidates may note changes to legal systems in Europe; torture; and different degrees of state control over trials. Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the role of prominent individuals and other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering James VI of Scotland. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The question is focused on England’s suppression of Tyrone’s rebellion, and the significance of Mountjoy’s leadership in achieving that victory. In considering the stated factor, answers may refer to Essex’s brief and disastrous period as Lord Deputy in 1599. Mountjoy replaced Essex, and was given strong support by the veteran campaigners Carew and Chichester. Mountjoy focused his attention on Ulster, Tyrone’s stronghold. He carried out a scorched earth policy, devastating the countryside and murdering civilians in order to provoke a famine and Tyrone’s surrender. This policy tied down the Ulster leadership within their own province. In 1602 Mountjoy defeated the Spanish invasion with a successful siege of Kinsale and a victory there against O’Neill and O’Donnell. Mountjoy’s fierce campaign, which contrasted strongly with that of Essex, led to Tyrone’s ultimate surrender in March 1603.

Other factors which influenced English success include divisions among the Irish. Most of the towns and cities, and the old English nobility, sided with England, while the native lords and much of the countryside, notably the Munster plantation, supported Tyrone. The English troops were well organised and disciplined, and Elizabeth was able to send reinforcements to see off the Spanish threat at Kinsale.

Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will address Mountjoy’s leadership along with some other relevant factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering some events connected with Tyrone. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.
The question is focused on the Irish rebellions of 1641-53, and on the reasons why the English found it so difficult to defeat the rebels.

By the early 1640s Irish opposition to English rule had become deep and bitter. There was strong opposition to the plantations policy, and Wentworth’s rule in the 1630s only fuelled discontent. The rising began in Ulster and spread rapidly throughout the island. The Confederation of Kilkenny provided the rebels with effective organisation; Ormond defeated the rebels in 1642 and 1643, but was unable to destroy their control of the country. The Confederates established regular full-time armies led by professional soldiers, and were able to field armies 60,000 strong. The first and second Ormond Peace acknowledged the strength of Irish resistance, and in the end the Confederates could only be defeated by Cromwell, whose fierce campaigns from 1649 led to the confiscation of Confederate lands and the imposition of a Protestant ascendancy. Other relevant factors include the outbreak of civil war in England, which diverted both king and parliament from Irish affairs; and foreign intervention, with subsidies from France, Spain and the Papacy. Confederate government established a taxation system to pay for the army.

Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will address a number of reasons for the time taken to defeat the rebellions of 1641-53, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering Cromwell’s intervention. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.
The question is focused on the outbreak of the Thirty Years War in 1618, and the extent to which challenges to Habsburg power caused that conflict.

In considering the stated factor, answers may note that Habsburg power had been consolidated during the Counter-Reformation, and in the early 1600s the Emperors remained determined to weaken Protestant power within Germany. The seizure of Julich in the name of Rudolf II in 1611 was seen by the German princes, and by France and the Netherlands, as a worrying extension of Habsburg power in north-western Germany. Both Rudolf and Ferdinand II attempted to assert their authority in Bohemia and to take action against Protestants, who formed the overwhelming majority of the population. This triggered the Bohemian revolt of 1618 and the outbreak of war. France was also concerned with the fact that she was almost encircled by Habsburg power in both the Empire and in Spain.

Other factors which led to war include Spain’s determination to protect the Spanish Road; Sweden and Denmark’s interest in expansion around the Baltic; and the aim of many German princes to gain complete independence from imperial control. Religious factors, which led to the formation of rival princely leagues, were also important.

Answers at **Level 5** will have a secure focus on the question, will address challenges to Habsburg power along with some other relevant factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At **Level 4** candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. **Level 3** answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering the Bohemian crisis. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At **Level 2** will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. **Level 1** responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.
The question is focused on the outcome of the Thirty Years War, and requires a judgement on whether or not France and the Habsburgs gained from involvement in the conflict.

French involvement from the 1630s aimed at restoring some balance to the European state system as well as protecting Protestant interests within the Empire. In this respect France was broadly successful. France made some significant gains in the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. She made significant gains in Alsace and Lorraine, and her European prestige was significantly enhanced. France went on to defeat Spain in the 1650s, making further gains in the Peace of the Pyrenees in 1659. Habsburgs successes were often outweighed by failure. The Habsburgs certainly made substantial gains in both power and prestige in the years to 1629. They were much less successful in the 1630s, notably because of the intervention of Sweden and France. Habsburg power was significantly weakened at Westphalia. Political control within the Empire, which the Habsburgs had arrogated to themselves during the war, was restored to the German Princes, leaving the Emperor with virtually an honorary role. Answers may compare the outcome of Westphalia for the Spanish and German branches of the Habsburg family.

Answers at **Level 5** will have a secure focus on the question, will address the extent the involvement of both France and the Habsburgs, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At **Level 4** candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. **Level 3** answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering some French successes or Habsburg failures. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At **Level 2** will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. **Level 1** responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.
The question is focused on the Restoration Settlement and on the extent to which it provided the monarchy with the powers and money necessary for effective government.

In framing their answers, candidates may note that divisions between Royalists and Presbyterians in 1660 meant that it was difficult to agree on the powers to be exercised by the king. However, by 1664 it was established that the king would exercise broad powers on war and peace. Triennial parliaments were established, but there was no mechanism provided to enforce this provision. Overall the separation of powers between king and parliament were not made clear, and this led to tensions between the two throughout Charles II’s reign, allowing the king's absolutist tendencies to develop. Answers may suggest that effective government was hampered by the unclear division of power. The financial settlement was much clearer. The king was to have an annual income of £1.2 million, though excise duties did not raise as much money as expected. This, coupled with a high spending court, left Charles with a constant shortfall, which forced him to issue the Stop of the Exchequer in 1672. Danby’s reforms of royal finance were not extensive, and for most of his reign Charles relied on parliamentary subsidies, which increased friction between king and parliament.

Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will address both power and money, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering some features of the Restoration Settlement. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.
The question is focused on the years 1678-85, and requires a judgement on why the Whigs were unable to prevent the accession of James II.

In framing their answers, candidates may note that the Whigs were in a strong position in the mid-1670s. Shaftesbury’s effective leadership played on popular fears of Catholicism and of arbitrary power, and the Duke of York seemed to personify these fears. The Popish Plot of 1678 provided the Whigs with the opportunity to demand that York should be excluded from the succession. Backed by mass support throughout the country, the Whigs introduced exclusion bills in the parliaments of 1679-81; Charles dissolved each parliament in the hope of securing a more compliant one. After dissolving the Oxford Parliament in 1681 Charles continued to outmanoeuvre his opponents and felt strong enough to ignore Whig demands for fresh elections; he ruled alone for the rest of his reign. The Rye House plot of 1683 gave Charles a further opportunity to attack his, and York’s opponents. Shaftesbury had fled abroad, and some prominent Whig leaders were tried and executed. The crises of these years might thus be explained by both the king’s use of his extensive powers, his own political skills, and the weakness of his opponents.

Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will address a number of reasons for the failure of the Whigs, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering the Popish Plot. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.