

Mark Scheme (Results) January 2010

GCE

GCE History (6HI02) Paper D

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Mark Scheme that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternately, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated **History** telephone line: **020 7190 4784**

January 2010

Publications Code US022892

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

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.

6HI02: Generic Level Descriptors

Part (a)

Target: AO2a (8%)

(20 marks)

As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-5	<p>Comprehends the surface features of the sources and selects material relevant to the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-5 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	6-10	<p>Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify their similarities and/or differences in relation to the question posed. There may be one developed comparison, but most comparisons will be undeveloped or unsupported with material from the sources. Sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information. The source provenance may be noted, without application of its implications to the source content.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 6-7 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 8-10 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	11-15	<p>Comprehends the sources and focuses the cross-referencing on the task set. Responses will offer detailed comparisons, similarities/differences, agreements/disagreements that are supported by evidence drawn from the sources.</p> <p>Sources are used as evidence with some consideration of their attributes, such as the nature, origins, purpose or audience, with some consideration of how this can affect the weight given to the evidence. In addressing 'how far' there is a clear attempt to use the sources in combination, but this may be imbalanced in terms of the issues addressed or in terms of the use of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 3: 13-15 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>

4	16-20	<p>Reaches a judgement in relation to the issue posed by the question supported by careful examination of the evidence of the sources. The sources are cross-referenced and the elements of challenge and corroboration are analysed. The issues raised by the process of comparison are used to address the specific enquiry. The attributes of the source are taken into account in order to establish what weight the content they will bear in relation to the specific enquiry. In addressing 'how far' the sources are used in combination.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 16-17 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 4: 18-20 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
---	-------	---

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

Part (b)

Target: AO1a & AO1b (10% - 24 marks)

Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

AO2b (7% - 16 marks)

Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.

(40 marks)

AO1a and AO1b (24 marks)

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 analytically (i.e. 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 simple statements. Material is unlikely to be developed very far or to be explicitly linked to material taken from sources.</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>
---	------	---

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

3	13-18	<p>Candidates answers will attempt analysis and show some understanding of the focus of the question. They may, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus. Factual material will be mostly accurate, but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor. At this level candidates will begin to link contextual knowledge with points drawn from sources.</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. There will be some integration of contextual knowledge with material drawn from sources, although this may not be sustained throughout the response. 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>

A02b (16 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-4	<p>Comprehends the sources and selects material relevant to the representation contained in the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-4 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	5-8	<p>Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify points which support or differ from the representation contained in the question. When supporting the decision made in relation to the question the sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 7-8 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	9-12	<p>The sources are analysed and points of challenge and/or support for the representation contained in the question are developed from the provided material. In addressing the specific enquiry, there is clear awareness that a representation is under discussion and there is evidence of reasoning from the evidence of both sources, although there may be some lack of balance. The response reaches a judgement in relation to the claim which is supported by the evidence of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 9-10 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 3: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
4	13-16	<p>Reaches and sustains a conclusion based on the discriminating use of the evidence. Discussion of the claim in the question proceeds from the issues raised by the process of analysing the representation in the sources. There is developed reasoning and weighing of the evidence in order to create a judgement in relation to the stated claim.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 13-14 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 4: 15-16 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>

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

Unit 2 Assessment Grid

Question Number	AO1a and b Marks	AO2a Marks	AO2b Marks	Total marks for question
Q (a)	-	20	-	20
Q (b)(i) or (ii)	24	-	16	40
Total Marks	24	20	16	60
% weighting	10%	8%	7%	25%

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.

D1 Britain and Ireland, 1867-1922

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (a)	<p>Taken at face value the sources are in conflict. Sources 1 and 3 emphasise the brutality of the Black and Tans and demonstrate their desire for revenge. Source 2, however, suggests that their role was defensive, trying to stop the 'cruel assassination' of Irish policemen. This is supported by a focus on Sinn Fein cruelty and the difficulties experienced by its victims. Developed responses of this kind can reach L2. However, if the sources are cross-referenced in context a more complex picture emerges. Source 2 offers reasons to explain the behaviour of the Black and Tans as demonstrated in sources 1 and 3. Source 1 is explicitly responding to the murder of policemen, but it is also a brutal response. The threat of a five-to-one retaliation, the abuse of Sinn Fein members as 'louts' and 'ragamuffins' and the intention to destroy the houses of their sympathisers are clearly intended to intimidate, or at least justify extreme violence in reprisals. This is supported by Source 3, where the attack is made on the whole village and there is widespread damage rather than an attempt to select the guilty. In both cases the violence is a response to Sinn Fein attacks on the police, agreeing with source 2, but in both cases the violence is extreme and generalised. In addition, Source 3 suggests a lack of discipline in the drinking of 'liquor' and can be interpreted to suggest that the murder of Brady offered an excuse for plunder and theft as well as brutality. The fact that many of the villagers fled as soon as they knew of the murder suggests that they knew what to expect, and indicates that such behaviour was not unusual. The provenance of Sources 1 and 3 also strengthens the evidence - one is a Black and Tan poster, the other from an English journalist. Source 2 may be less well founded, since Lloyd George could be expected to defend government actions and employees, but all three sources testify to Sinn Fein violence and provocation. It can therefore be suggested that source 2 is partially supported by sources 1 and 3. The Black and Tans were intended to defend the police and intimidate Sinn Fein, but they did this with extreme and perhaps unnecessary brutality. Responses at L3 will both support and challenge the explanation in source 2, while those at L4 will establish an overall judgement of the role and actions of the Black and Tans.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (i)	<p>The sources offer evidence to support and challenge the stated view, which can be developed and supported from own knowledge. Source 4 describes his success in building up the movement for Home Rule, and its extent can be inferred by reference to his ability to gain support from different factions (Irish MPs and 'ex-Fenians' who 'had nothing but contempt for constitutional' methods). This is developed by reference to grass-roots organisation (the Land League) and the creation of a united movement 'capable of advancing towards Home Rule'. Candidates can develop these points by considering the work of the Land League in 1879-81, its establishment as a national organisation, the raising of funds in America, and the roles of both Parnell and Davitt. The response of Gladstone's government in a new Land Act is further evidence of success, as is the Kilmainham treaty. The argument that he achieved a great deal can be further developed by cross-referencing to Source 5, which shows Gladstone's attempt to pass a Home Rule Bill and the effectiveness of Parnell's constitutional campaign. This can be developed by reference to the continued co-operation of the Irish and Liberal MPs up to and after Parnell's death in 1891. Source 6 offers further evidence to suggest that Home Rule remained a strong possibility in 1889, and that Parnell's character had contributed a great deal to that outcome. However, it also raises the counter-argument, supporting the stated claim, that ultimately Parnell's character and career was damaging to the possibility of Home Rule. The emphasis in the source is on his fall and the damage done by his refusal to resign, but more evidence can be added to develop the point. Source 4 describes him as 'arrogant and forceful', characteristics that can be seen as positive in some circumstances, but negative in others, such as the situation outlined in Source 6. This can be developed from own knowledge. The violence of the Land campaign, and the murders that followed, did much to discredit Irish nationalism, and were never adequately condemned by Parnell. Within Ireland the attitude of Unionists and landlords was hardened by the campaign, which also led to the policy of coercion and further division. His attempts to unite different factions led to some distrust, and this was compounded by the campaign of disruption in parliament, while his willingness to deal with both Liberal and Tory parties may well have contributed to the failure of Home Rule in 1886. It can therefore be argued that Parnell's leadership and tactics created opposition and helped to polarise opinion, doing long-term damage to the prospects of Home Rule. Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. Responses at L1 will offer limited range/depth of material and tend to treat sources at face value. L2 responses will attempt to cross-reference sources, but own knowledge will be limited or the response will be predominantly narrative. At L3 candidates will interpret and cross-reference evidence from the sources to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and support this with contextual knowledge, but there may also be passages of disconnected narrative. At L4 candidates will be able to utilise the sources in combination, interpreted in context, to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and utilise a range of accurate own knowledge to develop the arguments and offer a judgement. The question allows candidates to accept conflicting evidence and argue on the basis of own knowledge that one aspect of Parnell's leadership outweighs the other.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (ii)	<p>Sources 7 and 8 demonstrate the existence of rival forces in Ireland, both willing to resort to violence to achieve their aims. Candidates can use a range of own knowledge to explain the nature of these forces and the likelihood that both would take up arms. The question refers to 'by 1914', allowing candidates to draw on material from the whole period back to 1867 to explain the rival campaigns if they wish. They are also likely to address events from 1909 to 1914 to explain why the problem had come to a head, and why the links between the British and Ulster Unionism had provoked a nationalist backlash and weakened the position of the Irish MPs who 'stood firm by legality'. Source 8 emphasises the deeper roots of Sinn Fein's nationalist campaign, and indicates that civil war was threatened because of both long and short-term factors. However, source 9 suggests that it had not yet become impossible to avoid civil war. Redmond believes that Ireland will unite in defence against Germany, and this will include the acceptance of British rule until the war is won. Candidates can argue that Redmond was out of touch, as suggested in Source 7, but they can refer to the number of volunteers that came from both north and south to support his view and challenge the stated view. They can also consider the catalogue of British blunders that occurred before civil war did break out in 1919, using a counter-factual argument to suggest that it could have been avoided. Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. Responses at L1 will offer limited range/depth of material and tend to treat sources at face value. L2 responses will attempt to cross-reference sources, but own knowledge will be limited or the response will be predominantly narrative. At L3 candidates will interpret and cross-reference evidence from the sources to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and support this with contextual knowledge, but there may also be passages of disconnected narrative. At L4 candidates will be able to utilise the sources in combination, interpreted in context, to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and utilise a range of accurate own knowledge to develop the arguments and offer a judgement. The best responses may well argue that some civil conflict or civil war was likely by 1914, while challenging the phrase 'impossible...without' as too sweeping, thereby reconciling the conflict to establish an overall judgement.</p>	40

D2 Britain and the Nationalist Challenge in India, 1900-47

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (a)	<p>The sources offer conflicting views of the basis of British power in India and demonstrate conflicting attitudes among the 'Indian people'. Taken at face value Source 11 argues that British rule relied on 'respect' and 'prestige' and this can be supported by Source 10, with its emphasis on fair play and decency, and the claim in Source 11 that the ICS were known to be 'incorruptible'. However, Source 11 also highlights the role of the Army, and the need for force 'for emergencies'. Source 12 accepts that the Indians do work with the British, but demonstrates very little 'respect' and suggests that British rule is based on Indian ignorance. Developed responses based on these points can reach L2. However, if the sources are interpreted in context a more complex picture emerges. Source 10 emphasises the range of responsibilities as well as the geographical extent of the districts run by the ICS and the police, and candidates can argue that this could not be done by reliance on force, nor, as the speaker suggests, without Indian co-operation. The speaker's view of the qualities required can be cross-referenced to Sources 11, to develop an explanation of how power could be exercised through trust and respect rather than force, and that this implies Indian support on a wide scale. All three sources come from eyewitnesses who knew the situation well, and the willingness in sources 10 and 11 to admit to weaknesses suggests that they are at least trying to offer an accurate picture. However, the assumptions made are those of a small, tightly knit part of Anglo-Indian society, with a particular viewpoint. In addition, the provenance shows that they have the benefit of hindsight, and may not have been as balanced in their approach while actually engaged in governing India. This can be used to challenge the argument and it can be argued that British power relied on the threat of force to some extent. It can also be argued that the two are not incompatible - that force can generate a different kind of respect and that both were required to maintain British power in India. In this context Source 12 can be re-interpreted to suggest that although the speaker does not support British rule, and is trying to organise resistance, his complaint about existing Indian compliance does strengthen the argument that British rule was not based on force. Candidates may seek to reconcile the conflict by arguing that British rule was based on support, or at least acceptance, from the majority of the Indian people, but that there were exceptions, and/or that 'respect' was based upon assumptions of superiority and inferiority. Responses at L3 will both support and challenge the stated claim, while those at L4 will offer an overall judgement and may well argue that respect was backed by the threat of force, and enhanced as long as it was used with care.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (i)	<p>Source 15 directly supports the claim, and offers several reasons why Indian attitudes changed because of their wartime experience. Taken at face value Source 14 can be cross-referenced to support the argument, since Gandhi refers to 'British citizens of the Great British Empire' and encourages Indians to fight with Britain. Source 15 gives numbers of volunteers to develop the point. It can therefore be suggested that in 1914 the majority of Indians was loyal to Britain and showed no desire for Independence. Reasons for change can be derived from the point that the war 'dragged on' highlighting the effects of war weariness, and this can be developed from own knowledge, particularly the economic impact and the effects of increased taxation. The particular difficulties of Muslims, the experience of racism and the role of Gandhi, and the impact of British and allied propaganda regarding the rights of different nations can also be used to develop the argument, integrating the sources with own knowledge. However, Source 13 challenges the argument by highlighting the existence of Indian nationalism and effects of racist attitudes among the British in the years before 1914. These points can be developed by reference to 'White Mutiny' (if known, since it predates the specified period but has direct relevance) and the conflicts between the Morley-Minto reforms and the actions of Lord Curzon in challenging the Indian elite over Bengal and other issues. It can therefore be argued that the desire for Independence had its roots and origin in other issues and before the outbreak of war. Source 14 can be re-interpreted to show that Gandhi's support for Britain is based on the issues involved, and not just on automatic loyalty, to suggest that some Indians were already moving to a more independent relationship and conditional loyalties. Candidates can also use wider knowledge to suggest that British reactions in promising change might well have met the demands of most Indians in 1918-19 if the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms had been implemented more quickly and if relations had not been soured by the massacre at Amritsar. Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. Responses at L1 will offer limited range/depth of material and tend to treat sources at face value. L2 responses will attempt to cross-reference sources, but own knowledge will be limited or the response will be predominantly narrative. At L3 candidates will interpret and cross-reference evidence from the sources to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and support this with contextual knowledge, but there may also be passages of disconnected narrative. At L4 candidates will be able to utilise the sources in combination, interpreted in context, to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and utilise a range of accurate own knowledge to develop the arguments and offer a judgement. The best responses may well reconcile the conflict, for example by distinguishing the elite desire for a greater role in government before 1914 from later demands for Independence, and argue that the war played a key role in the change, or by arguing that all three sources suggest a gradual development of the desire for greater independence before, during and after the First World war.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (ii)	<p>The question focuses on the reasons for the eventual partition of India in 1947, and the relative importance of different factors. The stated view is most clearly and directly supported by Source 18. Candidates can develop the point by using wider knowledge of the impact of the war. The revival of Congress, the strengthening of the Muslim League, the Quit India campaign and the growing rifts between the Indian communities (including Sikh as well as Muslim concerns) can all be used to demonstrate why conflicts deepened. However, Source 18 also challenges the claim by highlighting the continued emphasis in Britain on avoiding partition in 1945-47, and addressing the role of Mountbatten in the eventual outcome. This can be developed by considering the work of the Cabinet Mission, the near-success of its plan, the errors of Nehru and Congress and the role of Mountbatten in moving towards partition, enhancing suspicions within the Muslim League and encouraging violence. Candidates may also consider how the war affected Britain and its ability to maintain control of the situation. However, Sources 16 and 17 both suggest that the problem was long-term and fundamental, and can be used to counter the significance of the war and its effects. Source 18 indicates that problems were increasing before 1939, and this is supported by Source 16, which describes the problem as endemic and long-standing. This can be developed from wider knowledge to suggest that the actions of Congress, the influence of Gandhi, and the failure of British efforts to make gradual changes deepened divisions. The increasing belief within the Muslim League that a united India would create a Hindu dictatorship, without secure guarantees for the minorities, meant that partition was already the most likely outcome by 1939. Source 17 can be interpreted to suggest that the war contributed to the Lahore Declaration, but Jinnah also emphasises the depth of traditional conflict between Hindus and Muslims, and this can be developed from wider knowledge to suggest that a workable system of government was unlikely to be found. Good responses may emphasise the interaction of different factors, setting underlying difficulties against the role of individuals (not only Gandhi but also others such as Jinnah, Nehru and Mountbatten) to argue for or against the stated claim, or to establish a balanced judgement. Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. Responses at L1 will offer limited range/depth of material and tend to treat sources at face value. L2 responses will attempt to cross-reference sources, but own knowledge will be limited or the response will be predominantly narrative. At L3 candidates will interpret and cross-reference evidence from the sources to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and support this with contextual knowledge, but there may also be passages of disconnected narrative. At L4 candidates will be able to utilise the sources in combination, interpreted in context, to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and utilise a range of accurate own knowledge to develop the arguments and offer a judgement. The best responses may well seek to reconcile the conflict by explaining the role and interaction of the different factors highlighted in the sources.</p>	40

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code US022892 January 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH