

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2014

GCE History (6HI01/C)

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2014

Publications Code US039065

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

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.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-6	<p>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.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
2	7-12	<p>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.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

3	13-18	<p>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 accurate but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
4	19-24	<p>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.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

5	25-30	<p>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.</p> <p>Low Level 5: 25-26 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 5: 27-28 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
----------	--------------	--

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 definitional, 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.

Unit 1 Assessment Grid

Question Number	AO1a and b Marks	Total marks for question
Q (a) or (b)	30	30
Q (a) or (b)	30	30
Total Marks	60	60
% Weighting	25%	25%

C1 The Origins of the British Empire, c1680-1763

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1	<p>The question is focused on the reasons for the growth of British power in India in the years c1680-1763, and the conditions which enabled British interests to become dominant over European rivals in the region.</p> <p>During this period the British were able to eliminate the threat of Dutch rivalry and limit the extent of the French, and the lesser Portuguese, interest in India. Responses may suggest a variety of reasons as to why British power was able to grow, such as the continuous presence and policies of the British East India Company (BEIC), the consequences of the Glorious Revolution (1688), the break-up of the Mughal Empire from 1707, the consequences of European wars and treaties and the outcome of acute Anglo-French rivalry in the Carnatic from 1746-61.</p> <p>To achieve the higher Levels, answers will need to both explain how these factors enabled the British to gain a dominant position and to provide analysis. Candidates may establish the primacy of a given factor, the changing situation over time and/or the inter-relationship of factors. For example, candidates might suggest that the events of 1688 were responsible for exclusion of Dutch influence, as different economic spheres of influence were established for the dominions of William of Orange, but that a more complex interaction of factors led to a diminished French presence. Some responses might suggest that although dominant in 1763, the British were not wholly in control and the French were still favoured by some indigenous rulers or that the new ruler of Mysore, Haider Ali was a potential French ally for the future.</p> <p>Level 5: answers will clearly address the reasons why the British were able to become dominant over European rivals, by considering a variety of factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will provide a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p>Level 4: candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider reasons for dominance through both explanation and analysis, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p>Level 3: answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly outlining a limited number of factors explaining growth of British power in general. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>Level 2: answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p>Level 1: responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2	<p>The question is focused on factors influencing the growth of the British Empire after 1713, and requires an analysis, and judgement, as to whether the outcome of the War of the Spanish Succession was the most important influence.</p> <p>When referring to the given factor candidates may refer both to the decisive outcome of the war itself and/or the provisions of the Treaty of Utrecht. In consideration of the role of the War of the Spanish Succession, responses may refer to relative peace in Europe for the next twenty years that allowed the British to take advantage of its growing Empire and, in particular, the specific gains made including territory in North America and the West Indies, Gibraltar and Minorca, and the granting of the <i>asiento</i>. These conditions enabled Britain to establish greater footholds in Canada, the Atlantic slave trade and trade with India.</p> <p>To establish the extent to which the War was the most significant influence, candidates might compare the given factor with other influences, suggest the primacy of a different influence or consider changing influences over time. Other influences which might be suggested are the impact of the slave trade, the growth of the British East India Company, the role of mercantilism and government policy, the development of the settler colonies in North America, and the re-emergence of Anglo-French rivalry in the 1740s leading to the Seven Years War. At the higher Levels responses might show the inter-relationship of factors, for example, that the territorial gains in North America led to a need for British protection which led to increased interest in the eastern Atlantic seaboard but also to increased rivalry with France in India which led to further wars and even greater expansion.</p> <p>Level 5: answers will clearly address the significance of the War of the Spanish Succession, by considering its influence in relation to other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p>Level 4: candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the role of the War by addressing its strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p>Level 3: answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by explaining the role of the War and/or the expansion of Empire. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>Level 2: answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p>Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

C2 Relations with the American Colonies and the War of Independence, c1740-89

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3	<p>The question is focused on the relationship between Britain and its American colonies, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the extent to which British attitudes towards control over the colonies changed in the years 1740-1776.</p> <p>It is expected that most candidates will concentrate on the 13 colonies of North America but candidates who also refer with relevance to the situation in Canada (or even the Caribbean) should be credited accordingly; answers could, for example, refer to the similarities and differences in relationships or to the consequences of the Quebec Act (1774). Candidates may suggest that between the years 1740-1763 there was an attitude of 'salutary neglect' towards control within the American colonies combined with the need to defend the colonies from external threat, particularly the French. Once the French threat was eliminated in 1763, the British determined that the colonies should contribute to future defence expenditure, implemented existing statutes more rigorously and introduced new statutes. The consequent chain of events led to an ever-increasing breakdown in relations that resulted in war and a declaration of independence.</p> <p>Some candidates might suggest that, after years of benign rule, the British attitude became more intransigent towards the colonies and at various key points the situation worsened until the King rejecting the Olive Branch petition declared the colonies in open rebellion. Other responses might suggest that British attitudes essentially remained the same throughout the period, in that the colonies were there to be governed to their satisfaction, and that it was only at the very last, from 1773-76, that British attitudes became openly hostile. Events which might be considered turning points in British attitudes include the Stamp Act (1765), the Boston Massacre (1770), the Coercive Acts (1774), the Battle of Lexington and Concord (1775).</p> <p>Level 5: answers will clearly address extent, by considering the attitudes of the British over time, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. The best responses may attempt to evaluate or integrate factors relating to change into an overall judgement.</p> <p>Level 4: candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider British attitudes over time, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p>Level 3: answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by outlining British attitudes with implicit reference to change. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>Level 2: answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p>Level 1: responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4	<p>The question is focused on the reasons for the British failure to win the American War of Independence, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the suggestion that it was caused primarily by incompetent British military leadership.</p> <p>In considering the suggestion, responses may refer to examples throughout the course of the war including Howe's missed opportunities 1776-77, Clinton's mistakes, the poor tactics of Burgoyne in 1777 and Cornwallis in Virginia in 1781, and the mistakes of Rodney in not reinforcing the navy at Yorktown.</p> <p>To establish the extent to which military incompetence was responsible, candidates might compare the given factor with other factors, suggest the primacy of a different factor or consider changing influences over time. Other factors might include British military weaknesses other than leadership, the geographical/territorial advantage of the colonists, the strengths of the American military and the intervention of the French and Spanish after Saratoga.</p> <p>Level 5: answers will clearly address 'how far...main reason', by considering the importance of British military leadership in relation to other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p>Level 4: candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the role of British military incompetence by addressing its strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p>Level 3: answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by outlining British military incompetence with implicit reference to importance. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>Level 2: answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p>Level 1: responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

C3 The Slave Trade, Slavery and the Anti-Slavery Campaigns, c1760-1833

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
5	<p>The question is focused on the campaigns to abolish the slave trade, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the significance of the use of evidence about the conditions on slave ships in achieving success.</p> <p>In 1807, despite not achieving the abolition of slavery, anti-slavery campaigners were able to influence Parliament to abolish the British slave trade. To support the significance of the use of evidence of conditions on board slave ships in the success of the campaign, responses might refer to use of such evidence by leading campaigners, particularly Thomas Clarkson, in his speeches against slavery and the popular response to such evidence. The first-hand testimony of the nature of the slave trade from individuals such as Olaudah Equiano and John Newton, the Brookes diagram and the evidence from the <i>Zong</i> case all added to a general awareness of the horror of the conditions aboard ships. Pro-slavery supporters were aware of the effect of this evidence on popular support for the anti-slavery campaigns and may have contributed to the position of those who persuaded Wilberforce that, although he may not be able to achieve the abolition of slavery, the abolition of the slave trade was possible.</p> <p>To establish the extent of significance, answers might suggest that despite the use of the evidence it required the leadership skills of the anti-slavery campaigners to make it effective, that wider moral and evangelical forces were more influential and that ultimately it was Parliament that passed the abolition act. In particular, it might be suggested that for all the campaigning about the horrors of the slave trade that it was the growing decline of the slave trade itself that allowed Dundas and other pro-slavery supporters to let the slave trade go but not slavery itself.</p> <p>Level 5: answers will clearly address significance, by considering the relative importance of the use of such evidence, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p>Level 4: candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the use of this evidence by addressing its strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p>Level 3: answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by explaining the influence of evidence about conditions on slave ships on the success of the campaigns. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>Level 2: answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p>Level 1: responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
6	<p>The question is focused on the influence of anti-abolitionists and the reasons why they were able to limit the success of the abolition societies in 1807 but unable to prevent slavery being abolished by 1833. Candidates may consider the different reasons for passage of the abolition Acts at different dates but to reach the higher Levels responses should attempt to provide a relative comparison of reasons why the anti-abolitionists were successful in 1807 but unsuccessful in 1833.</p> <p>Responses might suggest that they were successful in 1807 because of the strength of the lobby, particularly the role of Dundas, the continued importance of slavery to the British economy, and the existence of an alternative measure. The opportunity to abolish the slave trade gave the abolitionists a chance to eradicate what many felt was the most obvious iniquity of slavery as a whole and allowed the pro-slavery lobby to appear to support some amelioration of slave conditions in an area of the slave economy that was somewhat in decline. Fear of the consequences of slave revolt and Britain's participation in the Napoleonic Wars also led to reluctance from Parliament to support the full abolition of slavery. By 1833 the abolitionist campaigns had succeeded in re-invigorating the popular support which was so vocal against the slave trade, the slave revolt of 1830 had led to support of the slaves rather than fear and many of the reform Parliament MPs were willing to support complete abolition. There was now no alternative to consider and the lack of willingness on the part of slave owners to introduce amelioration measures in the early 1820s had only underlined this. With claims that slavery was becoming less economically viable, attacks from non-slave based interests such as the British East India Company and a lack of strong leadership, Dundas died in 1811, the pro-slavery lobby did not succeed in 1833.</p> <p>Level 5: answers will clearly address 'why successful...but not', by considering the situation in 1807 and 1833 in comparison to each other, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p>Level 4: candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the reasons for success in 1807 but not in 1833 by addressing its strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p>Level 3: answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by focusing on one of the dates or by explaining how each situation came about. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>Level 2: answers offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p>Level 1: responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

C4 Commerce and Conquest: India, c1760-c1835

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
7	<p>The question is focused on the consolidation and expansion of British control over India in the years 1763-1815, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the extent to which this was motivated by the gains made during the Seven Years War.</p> <p>French defeat in the Seven Years War left the British in a dominant position in India; the British East India Company held significant political and economic control, maintained control over Madras and Bombay, and the province of Bengal had been secured by Clive from the Mughal Emperor. Responses might suggest that much of the consequent consolidation of Company rule and expansion of British control across the whole time period was directly related to the need to secure these gains. Until 1815 the French remained a threat and the British became increasingly worried about the security of the north-west frontier which acted as a buffer to advances on India from the north. The British were worried about potential external threat from Russia, Afghanistan, Nepal and Burma. Despite having gained the ascendancy, the British also needed to secure their gains from internal rebellion and attack from indigenous Indian states. There were continuous attempts to reform and consolidate rule within Company territory and various Governors-General expanded territory in attempts to control the ruler of Mysore, the Maharattas and Ranjit Singh.</p> <p>To establish extent, candidates might compare the given factor with other influences, suggest the primacy of a different motivational factor or consider changing influences over time. Other motivational influences that might be considered are the desire for economic profit, the desire to reform, the aims of individuals, external threats and the defence of British prestige. Some candidates might suggest that, rather than just defending the gains made, the power vacuum created by the defeat, in some regions of India, also led the British to establish more formal control.</p> <p>Level 5: answers will clearly address extent, by considering the importance of the desire to secure previous gains in relation to other motivational influences, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p>Level 4: candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the role of the desire to gain security by addressing its strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages. Level 3: answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by explaining British consolidation and expansion. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>Level 2: answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p>Level 1: responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
8	<p>The question is focused on the nature of the expansion of British rule over India in the years 1763-1835, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the extent to which Britain brought India under more direct control.</p> <p>By the time the East India Company Charter was renewed for the last time in 1833 it could be argued that Britain was in control of most of the Indian subcontinent and was able to enforce its political, economic and moral will. By 1833 the East India Company was more of a political rather than economic force and the concept of the Raj had been established. Most of the major resistance to British power, particularly in Mysore and from the Marathas, had been overcome by 1820 with the Punjab being the only surviving Indian state in a position to resist.</p> <p>However, responses might counter the extent to which there was direct control with reference to the nature of power in the Indian subcontinent. It was not the desire of either the British government or the Company to be in direct control of the entire subcontinent as this would have been very expensive. The aim was for the Company to control directly the areas which brought greatest profit and/or required security and to rely on exploiting indirect control through Indian rulers to maintain stability in other areas. The British government had no direct control although it regulated the actions of the Company and supplied some of the military resources required to police the subcontinent. The Company organised subsidiary treaties with Indian rulers willing or forced to submit to Company oversight in which Indian rulers were allowed to enjoy a semi-independent status in return for maintaining peaceful relations; just over 40% of Indian territory was ruled by princely rulers. Candidates will probably refer mainly to the aspects of political, administrative and economic control mentioned above but may also refer to cultural controls as well. It is not expected that candidates will refer to cultural policies but candidates who do should be rewarded. Candidates may refer to the move away from 'orientalism', promotion of Christianity and campaigns against traditional religious practices from the 1810s onwards.</p> <p>Level 5: answers will clearly address extent, by considering the nature of British control in relation to the strength and weakness of the concept of direct control in India, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish extent of change in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p>Level 4: candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the nature of direct control in India by addressing its strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p>Level 3: answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by describing the nature of British control with implied extent. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>Level 2: answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p>Level 1: responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

C5 Commerce and Imperial Expansion, c1815-70

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
9	<p>The question is focused on the growth of British influence in Africa and Asia in the years c1815-1870, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the suggestion that Christian missionary activity was the most significant factor in explaining the growth of influence in both geographical areas. Both geographical areas should be considered at Level 3 and above but it is not expected that they will be addressed equally.</p> <p>Candidates might suggest that the role of Christian missionaries was more significant in Africa than in Asia as missionaries were able to establish more permanent mission stations, gained more recognition from the public for their role in anti-slavery campaigns and seemed to have more influence on British politicians. In Asia where British influence was either informal or major alternative religions already existed the influence of missionaries was less significant. However, from 1815 there was a clear Evangelical influence on British attitudes towards social reform in India.</p> <p>To establish the extent to which missionary activity was significant, candidates might compare the given factor with other factors, suggest the primacy of a different factor or consider changing influences over time. Some responses might suggest that the influence of Christian missionary activity in both areas was weak and that other influences such as trade, prestige, security/strategic influences, settler politics and British political attitudes were more important. It is possible that some responses might suggest that missionary activity was a hindrance to imperial expansion.</p> <p>Level 5: answers will clearly address ‘how far...most significant’, by considering the importance of Christian missionary activity in both areas in relation to other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p>Level 4: candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the role of Christian missionary activity in both areas by addressing its strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p>Level 3: answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by explaining the influence of Christian missionaries or by reference to only one geographical area. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>Level 2: answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p>Level 1: responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
10	<p>The question is focused on the role of the Royal Navy in British imperial policy in the years c1815-70, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the suggestion that its most important role was to protect British trade.</p> <p>Answers may focus on the protection afforded to British traders by the presence of Royal Naval stations and squadrons across the oceans, the protection of the West Africa Naval Squadron against 'unfair' competition from slave traders, the 'protection' afforded to Indian trade in the Opium Wars, anti-piracy campaigns and in enabling British traders to gain influence in the coastal regions of West Africa through 'gunboat diplomacy'.</p> <p>To establish the extent of importance, candidates might compare the given factor with other factors, suggest the primacy of a different factor or consider changing influences over time. Other roles suggested might include the moral dimension of slave protection and anti-piracy, the reinforcement of British prestige, and as a military force against international threats. Higher level responses will probably show the inter-relationship between the different roles of the Royal Navy.</p> <p>Level 5: answers will clearly address 'how far...most important', by considering the importance of the protection of trade in relation to other roles, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p>Level 4: candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the role of the protection of trade by addressing its strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages. Level 3: answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by outlining the work of the Royal Navy in protecting trade with implicit reference to importance. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>Level 2: answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p>Level 1: responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

C6 Britain and the Scramble for Africa, c1875-1914

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<p>11</p>	<p>The question is focused on the expansion of British influence in Africa in the years c1875-1914, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the extent to which it was driven by the desire to gain raw materials and mineral wealth. Candidates may choose to discuss expansion in relation to wider themes using brief examples or to concentrate on specific geographic areas in order to establish points about wider issues. Some candidates may refer to metropolitan and peripheral influences but these should be used to analyse extent rather than describe events to achieve the higher Levels.</p> <p>In consideration of the given factor, candidates may refer to the potential to exploit gold and palm oil in West Africa, cotton growing along the Nile Valley, diamonds and gold in southern Africa and the potential for farming crops, particularly, coffee in East Africa. The establishment of Charter Companies in West, South and East Africa seemed to imply that the British government hoped to establish indirect economic control rather than direct formal control and that this was encouraged further by men-on-the-spot such as Goldie, Rhodes and McKinnon. They might also suggest that this desire was not only confined to Africa itself but to protect the raw material provided by other parts of the Empire such as India, the Far East and Australia; establishing control over the Suez and Cape sea routes.</p> <p>To establish the extent to which expansion was motivated by this desire, candidates might compare the given factor with other factors, suggest the primacy of a different factor or consider changing influences over time. Other factors that might be considered include the desire to protect strategic interests, international rivalries, the need to control indigenous people and the role of men-on-the-spot. At the higher Levels some candidates may show the inter-relation of factors suggesting that early expansion into Egypt and South Africa resulted from a desire to protect the economic wealth generated by India but, that with growing awareness of the potential for resources in Africa, men-on-the-spot encouraged the British government to grant trading Charters which would later come under threat from international rivals, such as France and Germany.</p> <p>Level 5: answers will clearly address extent, by considering the desire for raw materials and mineral wealth in relation to the limitations of the argument and/or other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p>Level 4: candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the role of the desire to exploit economic resources by addressing its strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p>Level 3: answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by explaining the role of economic resources in the expansion of British influence. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>Level 2: answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p>	<p>30</p>

	Level 1: responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.	
--	---	--

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
12	<p>The question is focused on the territorial expansion of the British Empire in Africa in the years after 1885, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the suggestion that the most significant influence on this expansion was the Berlin West Africa Conference. It was in the latter part of the 19th century that Britain began to take more direct control of territory in Africa. Candidates may choose to discuss British expansion in relation to wider themes using brief examples or to concentrate on specific geographic areas in order to establish points about wider issues. Some candidates may refer to international, metropolitan and peripheral theories of expansion but these should be used to analyse extent rather than describe events to achieve the higher Levels.</p> <p>The Conference was acknowledgement of European rivalries being reflected in imperial expansion with the main players being Britain, France and Germany. Answers may focus on the decisions made at the Conference to establish the 'rules of engagement' for future European expansion into west and central Africa and its knock-on effect in the rest of Africa. With the impetus to gain formal agreements with local rulers and other European powers in order to claim territory, Britain looked to consolidate its rule in areas already under British influence and protect the 'edges of Empire' resulting in the further development of colonial rule.</p> <p>To establish the extent of significance, candidates might compare the given factor with other factors, suggest the primacy of a different factor or consider changing influences over time. For example, candidates might suggest that the Berlin conference reflected a process of international rivalry, particularly with France and Germany, that had already begun and that it merely increased the intensity of this rivalry. Other factors might include the inability of the Chartered companies to rule effectively, the reaction of indigenous rulers to increased expansion, economic considerations, domestic popular politics and the actions of men-on-the-spot.</p> <p>Level 5: answers will clearly address 'how far...most significant', by considering the importance of the Conference in relation to other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p>Level 4: candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider role of the Conference by addressing its strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p>Level 3: answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by explaining the role of the Conference/and or British territorial expansion. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>Level 2: answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p>Level 1: responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

C7 Retreat from Empire: Decolonisation in Africa, c1957-81

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<p>13</p>	<p>The question is focused on the decision to speed up Britain's decolonisation policy in Africa in the late 1950s, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the suggestion that this was mainly caused by the humiliating consequences of the Suez Crisis in 1956.</p> <p>Although the independence of Ghana in 1957 had been planned in advance with the belief that other African colonies would gradually gain independence, the speed with which most colonies achieved independence by 1965 was unexpected. In considering the suggested factor, answers may focus on the international attitude towards Britain post-Suez, the replacement of Eden with a Conservative government more open to change, the economic crisis leading to Macmillan's 'audit of Empire' and the galvanising effect on African nationalism.</p> <p>To establish the extent to which post-Suez humiliation was the main reason for speeding up the process, candidates might compare the given factor with other factors, suggest the primacy of a different factor or consider changing influences over time. Other factors which might be suggested include long-term economic and moral influences which were coming to the fore in the late 1950s, the decolonisation programmes of other European powers, Britain's desire to establish greater economic links with the Europe, the wider effects of the Cold War and the effects of African nationalism and direct actions such as Mau Mau. At the higher Levels answers may suggest that factors were inter-related focusing on the extent to which Suez speeded up the moral, economic and political forces which were already moving towards faster decolonisation with reference to world and public opinion, decolonisation in other parts of Africa, continued post-War austerity in Britain and the clear desire for independence from Africans themselves.</p> <p>Level 5: answers will clearly address 'how far...main reason', by considering the significance of post-Suez humiliation in relation to other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p>Level 4: candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the role of post-Suez humiliation by addressing its strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p>Level 3: answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly explain the influence of the Suez Crisis and/or other factors. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>Level 2: answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p>Level 1: responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	<p>30</p>

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
14	<p>The question is focused on the desire of African nationalists to achieve majority rule for Rhodesia/Zimbabwe, and the reasons why it took so long to achieve.</p> <p>Discussions concerning possible independence for Southern Rhodesia emerged in the late 1950s in discussions concerning the fate of the Central African Confederation. By the time most colonies had gained independence in 1965 the situation had still not been resolved mainly due to the presence of a significant white minority population. In November 1965 the white Rhodesian government declared UDI and it was not until 1980 that majority black rule was fully established. Candidates will probably refer mostly to the period from 1965 onwards.</p> <p>Reasons which might be suggested may focus on the weaknesses of the nationalists, the strengths of the white Rhodesian government, geographical and external factors. Although initially united, the nationalists split into different political and, later armed groups, each supported by different ethnic and social groups, and by different external countries. The white minority government was supported by an effective 'apartheid' system of social control, a strong determination to remain in power and by the white South African government. With the British colonial power unable, and apparently unwilling, to intervene in a land-locked county, external interests played a major part in the continuing civil war which ensued. For example, it was really only after the Portuguese withdrawal from Africa in 1974 that the white Rhodesian government began to be adversely affected by a lack of access to vital resources. Candidates may establish the primacy of a given factor, the changing situation over time and/or the inter-relationship of factors. Some candidates might suggest that it was only when the external situation began to change that the conflict was brought to an end, as South African influence waned and Britain became more willing to intervene. Others might consider domestic reasons more important suggesting that despite internal divisions the nationalists were beginning to gain ground and Ian Smith's regime was forced to come to an internal agreement in 1978 with moderate nationalists before finally giving in to majority rule in 1980.</p> <p>Level 5: answers will clearly address the reasons why it took so long, by considering a variety of factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will provide a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p>Level 4: candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider reasons for the length of time through both explanation and analysis, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p>Level 3: answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly outlining a limited number of factors explaining the course of the nationalist fight for independence. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>Level 2: answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p>Level 1: responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

