

AS
HISTORY
7041/2E

The English Revolution, 1625–1660

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

Mark scheme

June 2024

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 © 2024 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 the impact of William Laud as Archbishop of Canterbury in the years 1633 to 1640?

[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

- Laud, in writing himself, will naturally seek to justify his own policies and thus the provenance may be commented on as indicating that Laud was aware of the criticisms and opposition to his policies in the Church
- in 1639 there was more open opposition to the religious policies that Laud introduced and this dedication to Charles I by Laud can therefore be seen as a response, a defence, as Charles' authority and the reforms of the 1630s were being undermined but by linking his defence in print to Charles he was making clear that questioning the policies was questioning the authority of Charles
- Laud, in writing a dedication to Charles I, is reinforcing that the religious policies introduced were supported by the monarch and thereby enacted by Charles' authority as Supreme Governor. Laud's tone is shaped to outline why the policies were necessary as a response to the problems he saw in the Church but also for the benefit of worshippers.

Content and argument

- Laud argues that the lack of uniformity and 'decent order' in too many churches across the country had led good people away from worship, hence Laud's focus on the fabric of churches, such as stained glass
- Laud accepts that inward forms of worship, those more favoured by Puritans, are valid, but that the external worship of God is a greater form of worship and this was central to Laudianism, the emphasis on the 'beauty of holiness', the visual aspects of religion in churches, such as the vestments
- Laud stresses that he has only worked so hard and pushed through the reforms to help the people access God through external worship, for example, vestments, stained glass windows or music
- Laud stresses that ceremonies are important to protect the Church and religion from attacks on it, such as examples of iconoclasm.

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

Provenance and tone

- as a Puritan it would be expected that the MP making a speech would be against the changes brought in to the Church by Laud as Archbishop of Canterbury, Puritans regarding Laudianism as a form of closet Catholicism
- as the MP is making a speech to fellow MPs in the Commons in 1640, he would be shaping his message to be as persuasive as possible in projecting a negative image of Laudianism and this is reinforced by his negative tone and the repetitive use of the questioning in his speech to place emphasis on Laud
- as the speech is in 1640, the MP can attack Laud in the context of the collapse of Charles' authority which had allowed more open attacks on his religious policy.

Content and argument

- the MP focuses on Laud as the central problem with regard to the religious policies of the 1630s, the 'only man', who had directed the imposition of Laudianism, for example the moving of the altars. There is no reference to Charles I and this could be seen as in line with the accepted political discourse at that point of focusing on 'evil counsellors' rather than suggesting that the monarch was at fault
- the MP blames Laud not only for the problems in the Church but also for having 'infected the State' and directing 'Strafford', for example, in relation to policies in Ireland
- the MP argues that Laud directed the bishops, who are the instruments of his policy and by referencing them as 'popish' bishops not only indicates his own Puritanism but the mindset of Puritans who regarded the policies of the episcopacy in the 1630s as part of a 'design' to return England to Catholicism, for example, as seen in the Visitations used to enforce conformity
- the overall impression the MP gives, in line with the thinking of some Puritans, is that Laud was a key part of a conspiracy to subvert Protestantism.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, some students might argue that Source B is valuable in showing the bitterness that the Laudian reforms had caused but that the source only reflects the opposition of those of a Puritan mindset who were the most ideologically opposed to the changes of the 1630s. Some students may argue that Source A is valuable in showing the justification of Laud and, in particular, why he placed so much emphasis on the outward forms of religion, with the 'beauty of holiness' being generally more accessible for the bulk of the population than the Puritan emphasis on preaching. That both sources are from the end of the 1630s could be argued by students as valuable as it allows a review of the 1630s but also that they are at a point where debate of the religious policies had come out in to the open.

Section B

0 2 'Foreign policy was the main cause of conflict between Crown and Parliament in the years 1625 to 1629.'

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 foreign policy was the main cause of conflict between Crown and Parliament in the years 1625 to 1629 might include:

- the debate over intervention in the European war divided Parliament and the Political Nation from the Crown in terms of how to intervene and in alliance with whom
- foreign policy was a source of conflict between Crown and Parliament due to the financial consequences, seen in Charles' request for subsidies and the limited response from Parliament with the grant of £140 000
- the failures at Cadiz and La Rochelle were sources of conflict as Parliament were concerned about the mismanagement of foreign policy
- the influence over foreign policy held by Buckingham as Lord High Admiral was a source of concern for Parliament.

Arguments challenging the view that foreign policy was the main cause of conflict between Crown and Parliament in the years 1625 to 1629 might include:

- Charles' style of rule, specifically his provocative use of his prerogative, was the greatest source of conflict between Crown and Parliament, seen with the reaction in Parliament to the Five Knights' Case
- religious issues were a source of tension between Crown and Parliament, seen in Charles' provocative use of Laud in Parliament but also over the calls for the impeachment of Montagu
- finance was a source of conflict between Crown and Parliament, seen with the MPs failing to grant tonnage and poundage, or the reaction to Charles' use of the Forced Loan
- parliamentary radicalism was a source of conflict between Crown and Parliament, seen with the Petition of Right or the Three Resolutions.

Some students may argue that foreign policy was a source of conflict in Parliament as there was division over the nature and extent of intervention in the Thirty Years War. It was also a source of conflict due to the related issues that arose directly from it, religion, finance and favourites. Alternatively, some students may argue that other factors were a source of conflict between Crown and Parliament as distinct issues in their own right, for example, religion and finance. Parliamentary radicalism could also be seen by other students as a cause of conflict with the aggressive stance taken by some MPs in relation to the Petition of Right and the Three Resolutions. It could also be argued by other students that underpinning all these sources of tension it was Charles' approach to kingship in a time of Personal Monarchy that meant that the issues escalated to be sources of conflict as he was provocative in his use and defence of his prerogative and thereby caused a reaction from MPs fearful of the threat of absolutism.

0 3 'Pym was more responsible than Charles I for the development of a royalist party in England in the years 1640 to 1642.'

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 Pym was more responsible than Charles I for the development of a royalist party in England in the years 1640 to 1642 might include:

- the development of a royalist party was driven predominantly by a reaction to the actions of Pym as the leaders of the parliamentary radicals, for example, the Grand Remonstrance, which Pym was seen as the author of
- the development of a royalist party came as a result of a desire to protect the Church of England as a moderate Anglican institution and as a prop to social order, thereby protecting the position of most of the conservative Political Nation. This led to support for monarchy as the institution that oversaw the Church. This position developed in reaction to the apparent threat posed by Pym as a leader of the Puritan 'London mob' and brought clearly to the surface through his support for the December 1640 Root and Branch Petition, signed by approximately 15 000 Londoners, and with its call for the end of episcopacy. Pym was also seen as a leading promoter of iconoclasm
- fear of Pym, specifically and how he might use the influence of the London mob or parliamentary power, led to many of the moderate Political Nation being willing to support monarchy, if not Charles, rather than risk Pym establishing himself as a demagogue and becoming nicknamed as 'King Pym'
- the development of a royalist party was actually hindered by Charles' attempt to arrest the 5 Members, including Pym, in January 1642.

Arguments challenging the view that Pym was more responsible than Charles I for the development of a royalist party in England in the years 1640 to 1642 might include:

- Charles' willingness to accept the removal of Ship Money, Star Chamber, and agree to a Triennial Act, allowed some MPs to feel that he was not a threat and made them align with him in a royalist party looking for settlement based on Constitutional Royalist ideas. It may be pointed out that Pym, through his relationship with the Earl of Bedford, had some part in trying to bring about a negotiated settlement
- Charles' retreat from direct political action between May 1641 and January 1642 allowed a royalist party to form as it highlighted the radicalism of some in Parliament by what appeared to be their aggressive political actions in comparison to Charles' apparent willingness to accept reforms
- Charles, through the advice of Hyde and others, presented himself as willing to be a Constitutional Royalist monarch in the period to January 1642
- Charles presented himself as the protector of moderate Protestantism against what appeared to be a growing religious radical position of some MPs and part of the population of London, as Church authority was undermined, for example, by Parliament initiating iconoclasm.

Some students may argue that the development of a royalist party in the years 1640 to 1642 came as the general unity of the Political Nation of 1640 dissolved when consideration took place of what settlement to put in place. The radicalism of some in Parliament, notably Pym, and the actions of some outside of Parliament, led to a conservative reaction of Constitutional Royalism that allowed the formation of an increasingly significant royalist party across the years 1640 to 1642. Alternatively, some may argue that Charles' relatively passive stance to January 1642 helped facilitate this reaction as moderates saw the monarchy increasingly as a bulwark of stability. In this sense some may stress that many who were royalists were not supporting Charles personally but the institution and did so therefore in isolation from his actions.