

Mark Scheme (Results) January 2009

GCE

GCE History (6HI02) Paper D

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 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</p>

		<p>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 mostly 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>

		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.
--	--	--

NB: 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.

AO2b (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%

6HI02D - Mark Scheme (Indicative content)
The British Empire Challenged

D1 Britain and Ireland, 1867-1922

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (a)	<p>The sources offer evidence of increasingly extensive and assertive claims for Home Rule, if not outright independence. Taken at face value, Source 2 makes an explicit claim that hostility towards England is increasing, and refuses to guarantee that Ireland will remain within the Empire. This can be used to support the claim, but if the sources are interpreted in context, a more complex picture can be developed to address 'how far'. Both speakers claim that the Irish have a right to manage their own affairs, and both suggest that England will also benefit from a relationship based on consent. Therefore, in broad terms their attitudes are similar and this evidence can be used to challenge the statement. There are, however, significant differences in the arguments presented. Butt's case rests on the failure to establish the 1801 Union on the basis of consent and proper constitutional process and his idea of Home Rule is explicit in accepting English control of foreign and imperial relations. Contextual awareness and inference would suggest that this definition would include defence, war and peace, and other significant areas of government. Parnell makes no reference to the process by which the Union was established, implying that Ireland's right to manage its own affairs rests on more basic principles of consent. The tone of his argument is more threatening towards England, referring to Irish disaffection, the 'abominable' system of Union, and stating that England's only chance of gaining Irish loyalty is to grant Home Rule. This suggests that refusal may have unpleasant consequences. In addition, he refuses to guarantee a continuing connection, and suggests that it can only be earned by England's recognition of Irish rights. There are, therefore, very clear differences between the arguments and attitude of the two speakers, suggesting that attitudes have hardened. This is further indicated by Parnell's references to 'increasing' disaffection 'despite attempts at conciliation'. Candidates can therefore both challenge and support the claim in the question. Responses at levels one and two will tend to take the sources at face value, while developed inference can access the higher levels. By referring to provenance candidates can further evaluate the extent of change and growth of hostility. At lower levels candidates may well query how far two speeches by individual politicians can be taken to represent 'Irish' attitudes. However, provenance also offers more subtle forms of evaluation. Butt is presenting his demands to a hostile House of Commons, and is likely to moderate them and to use constitutional points to support his case. Parnell is speaking in Ireland to a predominantly Irish audience, after a period of bitter division and increasing violence. He may well, therefore, be emphasising points likely to appeal to them and to win their support, or to hold on to the support of those who are growing impatient. In addition, the fact that he does not use the same justification as Butt does not mean that he disagrees with the arguments. Where change is undeniable is in the refusal to guarantee a continuing relationship with England or to accord English governments any specific powers and this does suggest some growth of hostility, but falls short of a change of purpose. It could therefore be argued that Parnell's attitude represents a development from the foundations laid by Butt and the adoption of more aggressive tactics.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (i)	<p>The sources offer evidence for and against the statement, which can be developed by wider knowledge of the period. Source 5 states clearly that Gladstone lost Liberal votes in 1886 by failing to consult on the details of the Bill, and implies that he had also made an error in not previously campaigning openly on the issue. Candidates can develop these points by reference to party rivalries, and more extensively to the issue of Chamberlain and the Liberal Unionists, exemplified in Source 4. Gladstone's lofty manner, his difficult relationship with the Queen and the apparent suddenness of his conversion to Home Rule all helped to increase hostility to the Bill. However, Source 4 shows that Chamberlain's opposition was not simply a result of Gladstone's mistakes, although they may have exacerbated the extent of his opposition. It is clear that his determination to defend English rule in Ireland dated from at least 1881, and was motivated by his own imperialist beliefs and dislike of the violence accompanying Irish protest. Candidates can develop this argument by reference to the Land League, the campaigns against evictions, the response to the Land Act and later violence in Ireland between 1881 and 1885. They can also utilise own knowledge to evaluate how widely shared were these attitudes, not only by reference to the defeat of the Bill in 1886, but also to the election that followed. However, Source 5 also refers to another significant obstacle to Home Rule, which emerged in 1893 - the hostility of the House of Lords. This point can be used to challenge the statement, and can be developed by reference to the attitudes of the Lords, the extent of Irish landownership within the peerage, and the increasing tendency for the Conservative majority to use the Lords' powers to block Liberal legislation. These arguments can also be cross-referenced with Source 3 to establish the attitude of the Conservative Party towards Ireland and their growing links with both the Ulster Unionists and the Orange Order. Backed by wider knowledge of events, the nature of divisions in Ireland, the links with the Unionists and the role of Randolph Churchill, candidates can offer conflicting arguments suggesting that Gladstone's errors had a relatively minor impact and that the failure of Home Rule was caused by much more deep-seated problems. Alternatively they can argue that Gladstone's strategy of working with the Conservative leadership as mentioned in Source 5 was perhaps the only hope of Home Rule succeeding given the splits among the Liberals, but that it was a high risk strategy that backfired. Reference can also be made to errors by other politicians such as Parnell, based on own knowledge cross-referenced to Source 4. 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 consider the interaction of factors, to argue, for example, that the failure of Home Rule in 1886 owed something to Gladstone's errors, but that there were underlying problems that emerged to destroy a brief opportunity and prevent its reoccurrence.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (ii)	<p>The sources can be used to support and challenge the claim in the question, and the arguments can be developed with wider knowledge. Source 6 focuses on the impact of the Easter Rising, and Dillon's claim that it has divided the country and undermined support for Home Rule. He makes it clear that the rising did not have majority support, but that its aftermath has changed the situation. His final sentence implies that this is the fault of the British government. Candidates can therefore bring in their own knowledge of the Rising and of the way that the authorities dealt with the rebels, particularly the executions that followed, to draw out the implications of the source and establish the impact that Dillon is describing. This can be further developed by reference to events in 1916-18, including the elections and the success of Sinn Fein, to argue that the way in which the British handled the Rising was the main reason for the failure to implement the Home Rule Bill in 1918-19. However, Sources 7 and 8 focus on the fear of conscription, and the clumsy attempt to extend conscription to Ireland in 1917-18 as the main cause of the collapse of the Home Rule Bill in 1918 and the rise in support for Sinn Fein and Independence. Source 7 refers to the emergence of the problem before the Easter Rising, and can be cross-referenced with Source 8 to show its continuing impact thereafter. Source 8 demonstrates that in 1917 Home Rule was still expected to be implemented, supporting the argument that it was not primarily the Easter Rising that ensured its failure. This evidence can be used to challenge the importance of the Easter Rising and support the claim in the question. Again knowledge of the increased support for Sinn Fein in 1917-19 can be used to develop the argument. However, candidates can also cross-reference Sources 6, 7 and 8 to suggest that the arguments are not necessarily in conflict and that both problems played a part. They can be treated as cumulative, but it is also possible to infer that a common element in both problems was the tactless behaviour of the British and their lack of awareness of Irish sensitivities. All three sources can be linked to develop an argument that the underlying reason for the failure of Home Rule was errors made by the British government. Candidates can use own knowledge to develop these points by referring to events in 1913-14, when the British authorities and especially the Army showed a lack of impartiality in dealing with the Irish Volunteers and the UVF, and to other examples of British attitudes. However, Sources 7 and 6 can be cross-referenced and developed with wider knowledge to highlight the role of the IRB and the extreme nationalists throughout the period, in undermining attempts at compromise and playing on nationalist sentiments. It is also possible that candidates can use their wider knowledge to suggest that the failure of Home Rule in 1911-14 had already created a situation where success was unlikely. However for reward at higher levels this must be linked in some way, or used to evaluate, the role of conscription and the Easter Rising as evidenced by the sources. 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 interpretations, and utilise a range of accurate</p>	40

	own knowledge to develop the arguments and offer a judgement. The best responses may draw on the sources to assess the significance of events in 1914-18 within a wider context of Anglo-Irish relations, to reconcile the conflicts and offer an integrated judgement.	
--	---	--

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (a)	<p>The sources contain evidence that can be used both to support and challenge the claim. Source 9 makes it explicit, and implies that the alternative is to keep the Indians in subjection, and therefore create hostility to British rule. This can be cross-referenced to Source 10, where Shaw accuses the white residents of the Empire, including those in India, of wanting to see the subjection and even extermination of the native population. Candidates can rightly point out that 'extermination' may not include India, since it is only related to 'some places', but the accusation of a desire to see coloured populations as inferior is still explicit. Source 10 therefore challenges the claim and illustrates precisely the attitude that the Viceroy condemns. Source 11, however, supports Source 9. It demonstrates that some Indians were given positions of power, as Machonochie not only works as secretary to the Maharajah, but also speaks of him with respect. In addition it is clear that the British administrators were pursuing social and economic improvements for the Indian people. The claim in Source 9 can therefore be extensively supported. However, candidates who explore the implications of the sources and fully utilise the provenance can reconcile the apparent conflict. As a socialist, Shaw was likely to be critical of imperialism of any kind, and may therefore be particularly sceptical of the benefits of British rule as well as conscious of the racist prejudice attached to it. The authors of Sources 9 and 11 represent the British government, while Shaw's main accusation is aimed at the white community in places like India, whose interests were commercial rather than political and philanthropic. They can therefore be distinguished from 'British rule' to some extent, although not entirely. He accuses the bureaucracy of being undemocratic, but this does not necessarily conflict with a desire to 'elevate' the Indian people's conditions, or even employ them within the bureaucracy itself. Candidates may well be aware that a difference had been amply demonstrated in the years leading up to 1900, between the attitudes of the officials sent out from Britain and those of the local white population, who were often more overtly hostile to Indian ambitions and desire for greater power. They can therefore argue that while Source 10 is broadly accurate, it does not entirely conflict with the evidence of Sources 9 and 11. In addition, Source 11 provides an excellent example of the kind of 'elevation' that Ripon seems to envisage. While Machonochie speaks of the maharajah favourably, his attitude is also patronising, and it is clear that real power remained in British hands. Candidates can therefore argue that while it was the aim of 'British rule' to elevate the Indians, or at least their conditions of life, that did not imply complete equality, and many British residents continued to regard the Indians as inferior.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (i)	<p>Taken at face value the sources do support the claim in the question. Source 12 suggests that nationalists in 1890 were moderate and willing to look for gradual reform, and contrasts the situation in India with problems elsewhere. Source 14 argues explicitly that Curzon's attitude was provocative and directed particularly against the educated and privileged elite who served the administration and who were seeking some 'share in governing the country'. Source 13 offers an example of a member of that elite who turned against the government because of the partition of Bengal. The argument can be further developed by reference to the early history of Congress, the role of the educated classes and their relations with the British, the career of Curzon and his treatment of the 'Bengali Babus, the campaign against partition, the Morley-Minto reforms and the reversal of the partition in 1911. Developed responses of this kind can reach L2. However, a full analysis and interpretation of the sources shows that conflicting arguments are possible. Source 12 was written by a Bengal magistrate, and may therefore present a particular view of the situation in 1890, glossing over tensions that had existed since the Great Rebellion, the growing separation of English and Indian communities, and the open racism of the White Mutiny in 1883. Evaluated in context, the evidence becomes less convincing. Similarly, Source 13 shows not only the impact of the 1905 partition, but also reflects more long-standing inequalities and disappointed expectations among the anglicised elite, in the rejection of Ghose by the Indian Civil Service because he could not ride. This point can be developed by reference to the prevailing social climate in India and the attitudes related to the ruling class both within India and in Britain. Source 14 makes reference to Durbar of 1903, the role of the Maharajahs and the context in which Curzon acted, and wider knowledge can demonstrate that he was representative of widespread views which were manifest throughout Indian society. It is therefore possible to argue that there were more deep-seated causes of increasingly militant nationalism. These can be extended to consider the economic impact of the British occupation and debate how far 'the many' were involved. 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 be able to reconcile the conflicting arguments, for example by demonstrating that Curzon's decisions acted as a trigger in releasing resentments and ambitions that had been building up over a period of time.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (ii)	<p>The sources provide evidence both for and against the statement in the question. Source 15 explains that independence was impossible without unity, which can be cross-referenced and reinforced from Source 17. This can be developed by reference to the growing rivalry between the Congress Party and the Moslem League since 1922, as well as the wartime negotiations, the part played in defending the Empire by Moslem volunteers and the activities of Jinnah. Reference can also be made to the other Indian communities, such as the Sikhs, and their participation in the Round Table conferences. However, Sources 16 and 17 also show the significance of imperialist attitudes in Britain, which can be used to challenge the statement. Source 16 refers to the Imperial Defence League, and both sources reveal the role and attitude of Churchill. Seen in the context of his position as Prime Minister, he would offer a considerable obstacle to independence, at least until 1945. Candidates can support this argument by reference to wider attitudes, especially those of the Anglo-Indian community, and to the difficulties revealed by the passing of the Government of India Act. Using wider knowledge they can also challenge the statement by reference to other problems, particularly economic difficulties, the strategic place of India within the Empire, and the distractions of impending and actual war. 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 interpretations, and utilise a range of accurate own knowledge to develop the arguments and offer a judgement. The best responses may well point out that the factors are not necessarily in conflict, and/or argue that they reinforced one another by enabling imperialists to present a convincing reason for refusing independence, posing obstacles for those who wished to renounce imperialism, and/or by delaying a resolution caused the complexities of the problem to increase.</p>	40