

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2013

GCE History (6HI02/D)

Unit 2: British History Depth Studies

Option D: The British Empire

Challenged

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. 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 for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at www.edexcel.com/ask. You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

January 2013

Publications Code US034638

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

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>

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 the 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>The sources offer evidence both to support and challenge the claim in the question. Candidates might begin by an examination of Source 2 which is most explicit in its view that the divisions between Nationalists and Unionists were already beyond repair, explaining the fears being expressed about a Home Rule Parliament. Political concerns are directly expressed but economic concerns can be inferred from the comments about the class of people involved. The fact that the organisation that produced the pamphlet was formed the year before indicates the depth of the concerns being expressed. These fears appear to be addressed in Source 1 which talks about being aware of Protestant fears. Although it praises the Protestant 'industry' (which could be interpreted literally), it is very vague in how it will address Protestant concerns – implying that there are problems in dealing with divisions, and therefore perhaps supporting the view in Source 2. On the other hand, the argument could be slanted to indicate disagreement through an argument that the fact that Source 1 does try to address these fears and does try to identify an alternative scapegoat ('the English political parties') suggests there was some room for conciliation. As this was a speech made during the Home Rule debate, candidates could be expected to comment on this and link their points to the line of argument being made. The view that Parnell was willing to make concessions can find support in the arguments of Source 3 – Parnell will 'accept restrictions'. However, it might be argued that as these 'restrictions' only apply to foreign policy it does not address the concerns expressed in Source 2. Candidates might also comment on the notion of it being 'in principle'. As the author is writing against Home Rule, it might be expected that he would use any valid argument to support his case.</p> <p>Developed responses based on these arguments can reach L2. At L3 candidates will both support and challenge the stated claim, using evidence from different sources interpreted in context. At L4 they will use the sources, interpreted in context as a set, to reach a reasoned judgement</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<p>1 (b) (i)</p>	<p>The focus of the question is the extent to which it was likely by the autumn of 1914 that there would be armed conflict in Ireland. Candidates are likely to begin with an examination of Source 4 which supports the view that such conflict was likely and from which the quotation in the question is taken. They may decide to develop the argument that there were two groups who took different positions and that this made conflict more likely. They may also pick up on the reference to 'militarization' and use this as an opportunity to extend their arguments further using their contextual own knowledge of events such as the gun running at Howth and Larne. This can be used to reinforce the view that conflict was likely as a consequence of the existence of two groups which were both now armed. They might also infer from Source 4 that the situation was likely to be exacerbated by 'English involvement' and refer to the Curragh Mutiny and/or the political circumstances of the Unionists to support their reasoning. The fact that the Irish Volunteers were only 'nominally' under the control of Redmond and the Nationalists may be used to add further weight to the argument. Some candidates might, however, choose to take issue with the view expressed in this source that conflict was 'nearly inevitable' and challenge such a premise. This would be a legitimate concern to raise. In contrast to the view expressed in Source 4, Source 5 casts real doubts on the extent to which the Ulster Unionists were committed or able to take a violent course of action. Candidates could develop the arguments in this source by reference to their contextual own knowledge to demonstrate the obstacles in the way of violence. Source 6 offers some support to the argument presented in Source 5 by showing that even an Ulster nationalist did not take the threats of Protestant violence in Ulster seriously. Indeed, it may be that as this is a memo to the Cabinet, this is the source of Asquith's interpretation of events. Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available. The sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes.</p> <p>Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the degree to which it was likely that there would be armed conflict in Ireland by the autumn of 1914 with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view. The best responses may very well consider the interaction of different factors to explain the apparent conflict and offer an overall judgement.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (ii)	<p>The focus of the question is an exploration of the reasons why support for Sinn Fein had grown by 1918. Candidates are likely to begin by examining the arguments of Source 7 which identifies two key policies pursued by the British that both led to increased support for Sinn Fein – the Easter Rising and conscription. Candidates can be expected to develop an explanation of the impact of these policies by reference to their own contextual knowledge. They are also likely to cross reference Source 7's reference to conscription with the arguments of Source 8 at this point in order to help them develop this argument more fully and to demonstrate the strength of opposition to conscription. Candidates might use this point to explain why Sinn Fein won the 1918 election so convincingly by gaining 70% of the seats, as noted by Source 9. Although Source 9 appears on face value to offer a number of alternative explanations for Sinn Fein success, candidates may also argue that part of the reason for the 'rejection of the old Redmondite party' was rooted in its response to British policy during the war. They will need to explain this by reference to their own contextual knowledge of the policies of the party in 1914, just before the war broke out and during the war, including its response to the Easter Rising. Source 9 does however also offer clearly alternative explanations to British policies for the success of Sinn Fein. These are derived from a mixture of the policies of the Redmondites, a vague Sinn Fein programme and intimidation. All of these explanations might be further developed on the basis of contextual own knowledge. In contrast to the negative view of the tactics of Sinn Fein offered in Source 9, Source 7 also refers to Sinn Fein's tactics in terms of their ability to bring all shades of nationalist opinion together, but sees them in a more positive light. Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available. The sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes.</p> <p>Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the reasons why support for Sinn Fein had grown by the time of the 1918 election, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view. The best responses may very well consider the interaction of different factors to explain the apparent conflict and offer 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 evidence to both support and challenge the claim in the question. Candidates may begin by comparing Sources 10 and 12 at face value. Source 10 takes a positive view of the actions of Curzon based on his personal attitudes whereas Source 12 sees his personal attitudes in a more negative light and links these attitudes to his decision to partition Bengal. Where Source 10 sees an 'open mind', Source 12 sees 'arrogant pretensions'. Candidates may well explain these differences by reference to the attribution of each source. The cross referencing between these two sources can be developed considerably further and in different directions. The fact that Source 12 is written by an Indian may be used to confirm Source 10's view that Curzon was not liked by the 'natives', despite the apparently even-handed treatment perceived by Source 10. The specific example of an action taken by Lord Curzon against some British soldiers that is cited in Source 10, shows genuine concern. However, this action may be felt to be relatively insignificant in comparison to the problems that Source 12 sees as deriving from the partition of Bengal. At face value, it might be argued that Source 11 offers some support to Source 10 as it deals with a range of positive actions initiated by Curzon to improve the situation of the agricultural classes. A closer reading may however lead to other interpretations; Curzon's motives for these apparently altruistic actions was to protect British interests, to promote divide and rule policies, and this could be linked more closely to the argument of Source 12 than that of Source 10. This may not be a surprise as both Sources 11 and 12 have been produced by members of the INC, although it may be that they belong to different strands of opinion. The fact that Source 11 is written in English suggests that it is intended to appeal to an educated audience. Candidates are unlikely to consider all of these issues in the time available.</p> <p>Developed responses based on these arguments can reach L2. At L3 candidates will both support and challenge the stated claim, using evidence from different sources interpreted in context. At L4 they will use the sources, interpreted in context as a set, to reach a reasoned judgement</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<p>2 (b) (i)</p>	<p>The focus of the question is the extent to which the British were losing control of India in the inter-war years. There are many different effective routes through this question and candidates should be credited if they argue any appropriate case. Candidates are likely to begin by referencing Source 13, from which the quotation in the question is taken. They might consider Britain's use of the policies of coercion and conciliation, as mentioned in Source 14, but developed in both Sources 13 and 14. Sources 13 and 14 each consider an example of 'conciliation'; the Indianisation of the ICS in Source 13 and the 1935 Government of India Act in Source 14. Candidates might also make reference to the Montagu Declaration which is indirectly referred to in Source 15 as an early example of conciliation, although those who do not mention it because it took place in 1917 should not be penalised. Candidates can be expected to develop these themes in much greater detail from their own contextual knowledge and also to provide examples of coercion. Many will refer to the Rowlatt Acts and Amritsar as examples of this. They will need to consider the relative merits of these policies and the overall impact of all policies in weakening 'the Raj's grip on the subcontinent' in the period of this question. Although Sources 13 and 14 agree that British policy pursued the twin strategies of coercion and conciliation, they are clearly not agreed on its impact on British control. Source 13 sees the legislation as progressively weakening British control over time whereas Source 14 argues that it served to strengthen British control by further developing the policy of divide and rule. Candidates are expected to recognise this disagreement and to reach their own judgements as to which interpretation more accurately reflects the state of affairs. Source 15 offers support for the view expressed in Source 14 about the approach taken by British politicians, but it could also be used to suggest that India's political leaders were aware of this approach and thus Source 15 might be used to lend some support to the view expressed in Source 13. There is a considerable amount of material to consider in this question, and candidates should be credited for appropriate lines of argument, even if not all avenues are explored. The sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes.</p> <p>Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the extent to which Britain lost control of India in the inter-war years with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view. The best responses may very well consider the interaction of different factors to explain the apparent conflict and offer an overall judgement.</p>	<p>40</p>

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<p>2 (b) (ii)</p>	<p>The focus of the question is the reasons why India was partitioned and the two states of India and Pakistan established. Candidates are likely to begin by an examination of Source 16 which explains Jinnah's views in 1940 on the necessity for Partition. Using this as a springboard and referring to their own contextual knowledge, it can be expected that candidates will discuss the arguments that had been used by Jinnah since he first proposed a separate Pakistan. Candidates might, however, point out that Jinnah may have been using the threat of a separate Pakistan to wrest concessions, rather than being fully committed to the concept at this point. Source 18 could be used to present a counter-argument about the role of Jinnah, as here he is portrayed as one of 'India's two wisest political leaders' who was trying to 'stop the runaway juggernaut'. Again candidates could be expected to use their own contextual knowledge of events in India 1945-7 to support this interpretation. Source 17 could be used to point in either direction; it deals with the nature of the relationship between Mountbatten and Jinnah. An alternative explanation for Partition would focus on the role played by Mountbatten. Candidates could begin this line of argument by reference to two of the sources. Source 18 demonstrates some of the failures of Mountbatten, most notably his personal failings. Candidates might support the reference to his lack of wisdom by cross referencing with his approach to Jinnah in Source 17, despite his attempt to institute a 'charm offensive'. These arguments could be developed further by reference to contextual own knowledge to demonstrate Mountbatten's failings and therefore establish his role in Partition. Candidates may go on to discuss other explanations for Partition that are not identified in the sources, such as the existence of the escalating intercommunal violence, or Nehru's gradual coming around to agree with the necessity for Partition, but candidates are not expected to consider every possible factor in their responses. Candidates might also argue from the final sentence of Source 17 that such an outcome from events was always likely. This view can be confirmed by reference to the last sentence of Source 16 which also suggests that an 'artificial' Indian unity had been achieved by force by the British and was therefore unlikely to survive independence. Candidates are, however, likely to focus on the twin arguments of the roles of Jinnah and Mountbatten and to see the answer in terms of the contribution of one or both of these individuals. Well developed arguments that focus on these two factors should be rewarded appropriately. The sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes.</p> <p>Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the reasons for Partition with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view. The best responses may very well consider the interaction of different factors to explain the apparent conflict and offer an overall judgement.</p>	<p>40</p>

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code US034638 January 2013

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit our website
www.edexcel.com

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

