



AS HISTORY 7041/2E

The English Revolution, 1625–1660

Component 2E The origins of the English Civil War, 1625–1642

Mark scheme

June 2025

Version: 1.0 Final



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

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

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

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

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

Copyright information

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

Copyright © 2025 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

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

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

Step 1 Determine a level

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

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

Step 2 Determine a mark

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

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

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

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

Section A

- | | | |
|----------|----------|---|
| 0 | 1 | With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining popular radicalism in the years 1640 to 1642? |
|----------|----------|---|

[25 marks]*Target: AO2*

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will provide a range of relevant well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16–20**
- L3:** The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and having little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6–10**
- L1:** The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

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

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

In responding to this question, students may choose to address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

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

Provenance and tone

- provenance of a petition to parliament is valuable in showing pressure being placed on parliament but also an acceptance of the authority and legitimacy of it as an institution by presenting the petition. The content is valuable as the disappointed rhetorical tone illustrates the shift from the initial hope of supporters of the parliamentary cause
- the provenance is valuable as by referring to themselves as citizens the petitioners would be trying to distinguish themselves from the mob which is reinforced by the reference to trade in the petition and thereby, they hope to get a more positive response from MPs
- provenance from the citizens of London in early 1641 is valuable as they were a key part of the parliamentary cause and could be seen as part of the 'London mob' or organised Puritan opposition linked to Pym. The tone moves to directing Parliament to take action on their areas of concern which reinforces the pressure the citizens want to impose by presenting the petition.

Content and argument

- petitioners had hoped Parliament would address grievances built up during the Personal Rule
- petitioners believed that action would provide them with security, after scares in London with regard to royalist control of the Tower, and allow trade to recover
- the focus on Strafford, as principal agent of the King, reinforces that he was seen as a direct threat to the safety of Londoners if the King decided to use force to reassert his authority over the capital
- the focus on the Irish popish army and affairs of religion may suggest a Puritan agenda and link to Pym who was focused on these areas in Parliament but was not yet in the influential position he would achieve.

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

Provenance and tone

- the provenance of the source is valuable as an official record from the House of Lords in January 1642, reinforced by format/structure and formal tone of the content
- as a source from the House of Lords, it may be referred to as being more conservative than the Commons and more fearful of London radicalism. This may be linked to the development of Constitutional Royalism in the period of late 1641 through to August 1642
- the provenance can be commented on as of questionable value as a summary record of an interrogation which may lead to questioning of the veracity of the information. This may be reinforced by the record focusing on the legal issues the authorities wanted to emphasise as raised by the threat of the Baptists so that they could be removed, but the actual tone is valuable as this indicates a more neutral stance that may be used to balance this as constructed to portray the Baptists negatively.

Content and argument

- Baptists clearly anti-episcopal as a reaction to the imposition of Laudianism through the bishops that had become increasingly more forceful through the 1630s
- Baptists were arguing for gathered churches that had been emerging, especially in London as part of the underground Puritan network
- according to the interrogation, those questioned made a direct attack on the King and their dissent was civil as well as religious, reflecting the monarch's position as Supreme Governor
- there was also a threat to officers of the religious and civil law from their religious non-conformity and this was shown in some parishes, in London and across the country, in 1641–42 with examples of iconoclasm. As the House of Lords tried to maintain control, some religious radicals found more support in the House of Commons.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might argue that Source A may be representative of a broader range and number of people as a petition from a diverse range of London citizens in comparison to one Baptist church when the Baptists were a very small group in general. Distinction may be made between secular radicalism and religious-based radicalism. Reference may be made to both being London based radicalism and, while valid points may be raised about London being a centre for radicalism, there may also be reference to questioning how representative London was of broader trends.

Section B

- 0 2** 'The main reason for the deterioration in relations between Crown and Parliament, in the years 1625 to 1629, was the legacy of James I.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

Arguments supporting the view that the main reason for the deterioration in relations between Crown and Parliament, in the years 1625 to 1629, was the legacy of James I might include:

- James I left foreign policy in the context of the Thirty Years War and his avoidance of involvement as an issue that Charles I had to face immediately in 1625
- the development of Arminianism made the religious issues Charles I faced in 1625 to 1629 much more complicated
- the financial problems left by the extravagance of James and the failure to reform an outdated system hampered Charles' rule, as can be seen in the decision on tonnage and poundage in 1625, the limited subsidies granted or Charles' resort to the Forced Loan in 1626
- the influence of the Crown favourite, Buckingham, through to 1628, alienated the Political Nation.

Arguments challenging the view that the main reason for the deterioration in relations between Crown and Parliament, in the years 1625 to 1629, was the legacy of James I might include:

- James' legacy was improved relations with Parliament in 1624/25 but also without a commitment to the costs of a European war
- Charles' approach to kingship, in a time of Personal Monarchy, was the key underlying factor in the deterioration of Crown-Parliament relations to 1629. This was shown by his actions, for example, how he responded to the Petition of Right of 1628 or his manipulation of the judgement from the Five Knights' Case of 1627
- Charles' foreign policy decisions, in 1625 to 1627, added financial and political pressure to his early relationship with Parliament and linked to this his decision to keep Buckingham as his favourite and heightened his influence with his appointment as Lord High Admiral
- Charles openly sided with Arminians, as shown by his support of Montagu in 1625 and 1626, and the message he relayed through Buckingham at the York House Conference of 1626.

1625 was clearly a turning point in a period of Personal Monarchy and Charles' view of Divine Right and consequent dogmatic style of rule was fundamental to the deterioration in his relationship with Parliament. Nevertheless, Charles inherited a legacy from James I of fundamental problems in finance, religion and the constitution. The situation was, however, made worse by the tension brought about by the challenge of how to respond to the Thirty Years War. James had struggled with many pressures from 1618 but it was Charles' more limited approach to kingship that made the situation worse after 1625. Students may focus exclusively on a balance between James' legacy and Charles I's actions or may consider a variety of factors to explain the increasing tensions after 1625.

0 3 'In the years 1633 to 1637, Charles I was successful in forcing Laudianism on England.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

Arguments supporting the view that in the years 1633 to 1637, Charles I was successful in forcing Laudianism on England might include:

- Charles I ruled without Parliament during these years and in doing so, successfully relied on his prerogative to remodel the Church without the input of the wider Political Nation
- Charles I and the bishops imposed the 'beauty of holiness' measures in churches throughout the 1630s
- Charles I's imposition of Laudianism met very limited open opposition and even Puritan emigration was a passive acceptance of defeat
- the limited forms of resistance were dealt with through legal measures, such as St Gregory's Case, the Church Court of High Commission or, at a parish level, through the use of Visitations and Presentment Bills.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1633 to 1637, Charles I was successful in forcing Laudianism on England might include:

- that opposition to the Laudian reforms can be seen across a range of the population, for example with the opposition of the Earl of Warwick or Puritan pamphleteers indicates the limits of Charles' success
- Charles' alienation of members of the Political Nation, such as the Earl of Warwick, can be seen in their contact with Scottish Presbyterians and the use of agents to develop networks among Puritans in the east of England, London and New England
- the limits of Charles' success can be seen in the development of underlying discontent that saw motivated Puritans returning from New England or outward forms of Puritan opposition in 1637 such as Prynne, Burton and Bastwick
- Charles' actions also led to the development of a network of organisation behind Puritan emigration that also provided a potential network for opposition through companies like the Providence Island Company that was a direct response to the forcing of Laudianism.

On the surface, as contemporary commentators noted, England was at peace and calm in the 1630s that might suggest that Charles' forcing of Laudianism on England was successful. Indeed, many accepted or even welcomed Laudianism as a less demanding form of religion through the 'beauty of holiness' rather than the Puritan emphasis on preaching. There was, however, a growing underlying discontent from Puritans and other moderate Protestants, not so much at the measures but in reaction to their imposition which broke the Jacobethan balance. While Puritans were a minority, Charles' forcing of Laudianism on England increasingly alienated more moderate Protestants who saw that they had more in common with Puritans than Laudians. This led to a 'coiled spring' of opposition that historians have used to explain the crisis that engulfed Charles in England as a consequence of the Scottish Rebellion, triggered by the Prayer Book rebellion of July 1637, undermining Charles' authority across his three kingdoms and which, in particular, allowed opposition in England to come out in to the open after 1637.