

Examiners' Report
June 2015

GCE History 6HI02 D

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk.

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

ResultsPlus

Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2015

Publications Code US041775

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

Introduction

Centres and candidates are once again to be congratulated for their performance this series as examiners reported that the majority of candidates understood the essential requirements of the Unit 2 examination with the different focus of the two parts of the question. Many scripts demonstrated an impressive knowledge base in the part B question which compared favourably with previous examination series. At the highest levels of attainment, these scripts were combined with well-developed analysis. However, it is again disappointing to note that there remains a minority of candidates who perform poorly, both in terms of their skills set and their knowledge base.

In part A, a minority of candidates continue to work through the sources, largely in sequence, paraphrasing the content and with no attempt at cross referencing. Whilst it is the case that many candidates understand the language of cross referencing, not all actually engage fully in the processes, merely asserting that the sources either agree or disagree without explaining how they have arrived at this conclusion. Such responses are unlikely to move beyond level 2, even where they clearly understand the issues being raised by the sources. There also appeared to be a number of candidates who were using their own knowledge to develop points raised in the content of the sources in this question in this exam series. There is no credit for this in part A and thus, such candidates waste time that would be better spent developing those aspects of the answer that do gain credit – cross referencing, a consideration of provenance linked to the arguments and judgements. There seemed to be certain stock responses given to particular kinds of sources which could not be justified on the basis of the information that the provenance provided. For example, in those options where letters were used, there were a significant number of candidates who assumed that such letters were private, even where it would appear much more likely that they would be in the public domain.

In part B, there appeared to be fewer candidates this series who relied completely on the material in the sources. More candidates demonstrated some range and depth of knowledge that could be applied to the part B questions. The best answers used the sources to shape the argument and raise issues which were supported and developed with the use of detailed and specific own knowledge. It continues to be the case that despite comments in many previous examiners' reports regarding the focus of AO2b, candidates continue to comment to a greater or lesser extent on provenance in their responses to part B. Such comments are frequently very generic e.g. the historian can be trusted because they have the benefit of hindsight (or they cannot be trusted because they were not an eye witness to the event). In any event, such comments, even if well developed, generally do not contribute to AO2b, which is what is being tested in part B. Some candidates spend an excessive amount of time on this and they would do well to develop their arguments in relation to the question, rather than write whole paragraphs on provenance which can earn no credit under AO2b.

Candidates should take care that they can spell technical words and significant names correctly, especially when those words and names form part of the question or the sources. Where candidates have a few minutes left at the end of the exam, they would be well advised to check their work. Fewer candidates this series used the word 'infer' incorrectly, although there did appear to be some increase in the use of 'bias' often incorrectly spelled.

The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

Question 1 (a)

This question worked well and the sources presented few difficulties for candidates, although weaker answers tended not to recognise some of the nuances, particularly in Source 3.

Some excellent answers were seen where candidates were able to cross reference with confidence, consider the implications of the provenance and reach measured judgements in relation to the question. Such answers might, for example, link the arming of the Orangemen in Source 3 to the comments made in Source 1. Whilst most candidates attempted to engage in some cross referencing, there remains a significant minority who take a source by source approach.

Often such candidates were aware of the need to cross reference, and were able to show, for example in an introduction or conclusion, or in transition from one section to the other, that they understood how sources differed or agreed, yet essentially were still following a simple structure from Source 1 through to Source 3, without direct supporting evidence and development.

Most candidates did identify some support for the view to be found in Sources 1 and 2 whilst disagreement was to be found in Sources 1 and 3.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

(a) To a certain extent all of the sources suggest that violence is inevitable even if they don't want it. Source 2, for example, is a letter ~~from~~ from John Redmond who was leader of the nationalist party to Asquith who was prime minister. It states that he has 'full knowledge' of the state of his country and doesn't think a rebellion would be good for it. This suggests the redmond was actually looking out for his country though it could be seen as tactical for the party.

Source 1 partially supports source 2 by saying that 'peaceful methods will be tried', This suggests that the methods they intend on using aren't peaceful. This is because they say they will only try peaceful methods. They don't seem too keen on the idea.

Source 1 is very much a unionist source while source 2 and 3 are more nationalist, which means they are going to have different views.

However, source 3 shows that Patrick Pearse knew violence was coming and so he was happy to see people becoming 'accustomed' to the use of arms. On the other ~~hand~~ hand towards the end of source 3, it

((a) continued) starts to sound less like protection and more like a rebellion. The source stated 'he may make mistakes in the beginning and shoot the wrong people' This suggests that Pearse ~~is~~ takes killing quite lightly. In source two however, in Redmond's letter he states that the rebellion is ~~is~~ flawed and there is no 'foundation.'

Source 1 states that they will use violence if 'forced' to by the British government's actions. This suggests that they are very willing to use violence if they are pushed. Willoughby may have used the word 'forced' to make the use of violence seem not so his fault, he's shifting the blame.

Overall to a certain extent I agree with the statement in the question as it can be backed up by source 2, however violence seem inevitable in sources 1 and 3. In source 3 people are already getting armed! I think that violence seems to be in the near future (either using 1916) ~~but~~ but there may no be much of a plan behind it.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a level 2 response. The candidate uses some of the language of cross referencing e.g. 'partially supports' but is really only asserting comparisons rather than engaging in developed cross referencing. There is a mention of the provenance of the sources, but again, this is stated rather than explored and developed.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Cross referencing and consideration of provenance needs to be developed and explored to achieve the higher levels.

Question 1 (b) (i)

This question was answered by slightly more candidates than question 1bii, most of whom found the sources accessible and were able to use these together with varying amounts of own knowledge to produce a range of responses. A key issue for some candidates was a lack of familiarity with the work of Gladstone's first ministry; hence weaker candidates tended to rely very heavily on the content of the sources as the basis of their response or discussed Home Rule in some detail. Many candidates had a very good working knowledge of the key issues of land, education and religion, which were signposted for them in Source 4. Some candidates focused their analysis on the success and failure of these policies, but where candidates were able to develop these themes in combination with the precise focus of the question as to whether this policy was 'doomed to fail', impressive answers were the result.

It was disappointing to note that once again this year many candidates were still making generic points, some at great length, regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b. This issue has been highlighted in previous reports, but the continuing practice disadvantages candidates who spend time that would be more usefully spent on focusing on the question.

Answer EITHER part (b) (i) OR part (b) (ii) of your chosen question.

(b)i) All sources offer valid evidence some which support the statement and some which question the statement. Source 5, for example, blatantly states that 'Gladstone's policy was fatally flawed and doomed to fail.' This obviously supports the statement. However the extract is from a book which means opinion could vary. Source 6 is also from a book but offers a very different view.

Source 4 is an election speech made by Gladstone himself. This suggests that there will be some bias towards himself and ~~his~~ his plans. However Gladstone's speech must have been liked by the public as he was elected prime minister that same year. (1868.) Source 5 and 6 were published 100+ years after Gladstone became prime minister meaning a lot of the facts will be wrong. (or told differently by other people.)

When Gladstone became Prime Minister the first thing he said was 'I am going to pacify Ireland.' Gladstone states in Source 4 that he wants a 'freedom' from the Protestant Assembly, he wants to 'branch off'. In Source 6, it supports Gladstone. It states that his 'understanding of the Irish problem increased' however in Source 5 it ~~states~~ suggests that 'unfortunately' all of this

(b) continued) understanding 'came from books.'

Gladstone was very much a Unionist until later on in his political career when he worked closely with Parnell. Source 5 suggests Gladstone assumed only an 'Englishman could solve the question.' Source 5 and Source 6 seem to say that he was good at the little details even ~~an~~ an 'obvious mastery'. Gladstone is described as concerning 'details.' However they both suggest that Gladstone needed to look ~~deeper~~ deeper if he wanted 'real improvement'.

Source 4 is hard to judge as it is coming from Gladstone himself. He will of been quite bias towards himself and may have just said what the people wanted to hear.

Gladstone had many successful and unsuccessful policies as his time as Prime Minister. A Church Act, University Act, (which failed) 3 Land Acts. Gladstone's first policy - the 'Disestablishment Act of 1869' as shown in Source 6 was the first 'breach in the union'. This was a

big step for Gladstone. However source 3 says 'there was no appreciation of the deeper problems' which contradicts source 6 saying 'Gladstone immersed himself in the problems of Irish agriculture.' This suggests

((b) continued) that an opinion of Gladstone was very 2 sided. Gladstone wanted change. It's shown in source 4 'we aim at the destruction of that system.' He wants to change the system of Ireland.

One thing that all the sources have in common is that they are all second hand sources. Source 4 is probably most likely correct some words could have been changed or not even noted.

Source 6 describes Gladstone's plans into the future as a ~~entire~~ ~~entire~~ 'crusade.' This suggests exciting and adventurous, with a possibility of failure. However it does remain positive. While source 3 suggests that he's taking everything too lightly.

Overall to a certain extent I agree with the statement that Gladstone was 'doomed to fail' as the sources show ~~me~~ that he wasn't looking deep enough to solve the long remaining questions and problems. However Gladstone did bring about change in his first, second third and fourth ministry. All of the acts and bills created will lead to something bigger even if Gladstone doesn't cause that something. I don't fully agree that he was 'doomed to fail' I don't think he was in that

bad of a state. The policy however wasn't amazing but
(b) continued) it was a very important step and 'milestone'
for gradstone.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response is level 2 in both assessment objectives. The answer is heavily dependent on the sources and has very limited own knowledge to support the material that is provided in the sources. There is some implicit argument but not fully developed analysis. A considerable amount of time has been spent discussing provenance.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

This question tests AO2b so that AO2a comments on provenance earn no credit and waste valuable time.

Question 1 (b) (ii)

This question was answered by slightly fewer candidates than 1bi, most of whom found the sources accessible. It was, however, disappointing to note that so many candidates failed to explicitly define the aims of Sinn Féin, especially as this was signposted very clearly in Source 7.

The most effective responses were able to clearly test the aims identified in Source 7 against the material provided in Sources 8 and 9 and developed and supported through detailed own knowledge.

Weaker answers often took a source by source approach to the question, relying very heavily on the content of the sources and missing the links that could be made between Source 7 and the other two sources.

It was also disappointing to note that once again this year many candidates were still making generic points, some at great length, regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b. This issue has been highlighted in previous reports, but the continuing practice disadvantages candidates who spend time that would be more usefully spent on focusing on the question.

(b) Do you agree with the view that the signing of the Anglo-Irish Treaty in 1921 demonstrated that Sinn Féin had achieved its aims in the period to 1922?

8	9 7
Yes	No
<ul style="list-style-type: none">- had own parliament- could control internal affairs- Dail voted in favour of the Bill- De Valera took role of independence by 2 votes.- pro treaty party won 78% of vote in 1921 May election.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- partition - L-G always going to get partition Dec 1920 North Ireland open.- Sinn Féin wanted complete independence.- Easter rising proclamation- still had to do oath of loyalty to crown.- 4 courts- Collins & IRA attacked members guns = triggered civil war.- Collins assassinated.

((b) continued) Source 8 agrees that the signing of the treaty demonstrated that Sinn Féin had achieved its aims, whereas sources 7 and 8 disagree and believe that Sinn Féin had not achieved their aims. Source 9 is the strongest viewpoint as it acknowledges the fact that the division of Sinn Féin into pro-~~and~~^{treaty} and anti-treaty factions led to a civil war which killed more than one million people (5000). Source 9 suggests that Sinn Féin had not achieved their aims and were not satisfied.

Sources 7 and 9 agree more closely as they both believe Sinn Féin had not achieved its aims as ~~the~~ Ireland was "an Irish free state" (S9) when it wanted to be an "Republic" S7. This is a strong viewpoint as P. Pearse ~~and~~ to read out on the steps ~~of~~ of the Post Office ~~is~~ on Easter Monday 1916 that Ireland was to be a Republic - however this is less strong as although the Easter Rising was associated with Sinn Féin - Sinn Féin did not normally advocate it.

Source 9 is a stronger viewpoint than source 8 as it shows that those in the Dail were

((b) continued) nor all happy about the treaty, which ^{was} causing "deep disagreements". This is backed up by the fact that Collins said that when he signed the treaty he had "signed his death warrant" - showing that he knew the treaty would not be accepted by many Sinn Féiners as it did not go far enough. * pg 14

The fact that de Valera refused to go to the treaty and instead sent Collins in October 1921 showed that he knew any settlement would not be accepted - source 7 ^{shows} ~~says~~ this is because of the ~~de~~ aim for "sovereign independence" - i.e. independent of the British crown. This is substantiated by the fact that many disagreed with the treaty on the grounds that Ireland still had to swear allegiance to the crown. // source 9 is a stronger viewpoint than source 7 as it acknowledges that not everyone was opposed to the treaty - mainly the "radical nationalists". This suggests that source 9 also agrees to an extent that the majority of people were happy with the treaty and that ~~the~~ Sinn Féin had achieved its aims - this is substantiated by the fact that in the May

((b) continued) 1921 election 78% of the vote went to the pro-treaty Collins party. Shortly after De Valera lost ~~the~~ his role of confidence in the Dail (established 19th Jan 1921).

However the fact that De Valera only lost the vote by two votes suggests many were not satisfied with the treaty, in terms of Sinn Féin's original ambition.

Source 8 agree's ~~is~~ strongly that the Anglo-Irish treaty ~~is~~ satisfied Sinn Féin's aims as it "secured the evacuation of Ireland after seven hundred years" - this is a weak viewpoint as it does not consider the fact that Ireland was plunged back into civil war so shortly after the treaty was signed - when Collins was asked to show the four wounds which the anti-treaty IRA members had captured in Dublin - using British guns, Sinn Féin's aims had clearly not been fulfilled.

However similarly to source 9 - ~~the~~ which acknowledges the opposition of the radicals, the majority of people did support the treaty - even within Sinn Féin - it was just the radicals who were not satisfied.

((b) continued) as Ireland was now able to "free herself from resources, direct her own forces and guide her own destinies" (S8) - this was made clear by the fact that the British troops withdrew from Ireland, handing power over to the IRA. Source 8 holds a stronger viewpoint than source 7, which suggests that ~~the~~ very few of the Sinn Féin aims had been achieved - much in terms of their manifesto could be said to be true however ~~the~~ S8 highlights the victory that the majority of people in Ireland had secured. - and Arthur Griffith (founder of Sinn Féin) "claims they had brought back Ireland to a status of equality with England".

Overall the sources suggest that Sinn Féin's aims had not been achieved through the Anglo-Irish Treaty, this is true however many Sinn Féin supporters were happy with the settlement. Source 9 is the strongest viewpoint as it shows that fundamentally Ireland had not been given a republic, it was partitioned from Northern Ireland - however it slightly suggests

((b) continued) that most of the disagreements
lied with the "radical nationalism" and
more in the Dail² - which led to civil war.
This is repeated by the fact that support for
the treaty in the Dail was only voted for by
64 votes to 57 showing there was not a
general concensus about whether Sinn
Fein had achieved its aims. Source 8 is
not a strong new point as it does not consider
any of the consequences of the treaty - especially
the negative ones.

* and signed the treaty under the
threat of ~~an~~ invasion by Lloyd & George -
shows his hand if was forced and he may

((b) continued) not have signed if he hadn't been
pressured.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response uses the sources very well as the basis of its argument and integrates some sound own knowledge with those sources to reach some secure judgements in relation to the question. It is level 4 in both assessment objectives, being slightly stronger in the level for AO2b than for AO1 because there is a touch of repetition at times.

Question 2 (a)

Candidates clearly found all of the sources accessible and there was very little evidence of quotes being extracted and taken out of context with this set of sources.

Many candidates attempted to cross reference in their responses even though at the lower levels this generally involved matching quotes extracted from the sources without developing an explanation of how this related to the question focus. Often such responses tended to see the sources in terms of agreement from Sources 10 and 12 and disagreement from Source 11. At the higher levels, candidates were able to make nuanced points based on the sources. This could involve a comparison of Source 10 and Source 12's views on separate electorates, which would then be developed using the provenance to explain the difference or an awareness that although both Source 10 and Source 12 both agree and disagree with the view, their emphasis is different. There were more candidates this year than last year who were again approaching this question on a source by source basis – this misses the fundamental task of cross referencing. Most candidates attempted to consider the provenance, but at the lower levels this tended to amount to assertions and generalised comments.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

(a) At first glance, Sources 10 and 11 disagree with the statement that the Morley-Minto Reforms were "acceptable" to the Indian people, while Source 12 supports the statement.

Sources 11 and 10 both depict the Morley-Minto reforms in a negative way, source 10 being more formally dismissive "strong sense of disapproval" (due to its official nature - a Resolution by the Indian National Congress). Source 11 is also disapproving of the reforms calling them a "huge farce" and they were "just the opposite of reforms" - the more informal and angry language is a result of the source's nature being a letter from father to son (Motilal Nehru to Jawaharlal Nehru). This more informal provenance also explains the sardonic joke Nehru makes towards Morley's advisory council - calling them "Noodles". This implies their stupidity and how the Indian people did not find the reforms acceptable.

yet the main difference between sources 10 and 11 is that source 10 admits that the reforms were to some extent "appreciated" but not entirely, while 11 just depicts strong disapproval of the reforms. Source 10 does admit that the British (eg. Morely) did grant a strong sense of "fairly liberal measure of constitutional reform" while source 11 just reduces them as "so-called reforms." While source 12 calls them "a genuine step forward." This could be attributed to the prominence of the sources which both sources 10 and 11 come from members of the Indian National Congress while 13, which finds the reforms "acceptable" is from a Muslim perspective. Considering Congress was dominated by Hindus, it is unsurprising they did not approve (or had a "strong sense of disapproval" (10)) towards "the creation of separate electorates" (10) while source 12 considers the reforms to have "safeguarded" Muslim communities.

However source 13 is the only source with the benefit of hindsight (written in 1954). This explains Khan calling them a "step forward" as he is aware of partition and the eventual Muslim state, and this was the first step in that direction. On the other hand, sources 10 and 11 are both from the year of the reforms and soon after (source 11 stating "has at last been published") which means the authors have most likely had the shock of the announcement and is an immediate reaction, and emotional in the

(a) continued) case of source 11. Also considering most members of Congress wanted to work with the British at this time (especially post the 1907 split of the Radical members) it is unsurprising source 10 begins with "gratefully apprecia(ting)" the reforms and calling them "fairly" liberal. This "fairly" implies they want more from them - or in this case less concessions to the Muslims such as also explored in source 12 which explores Khan's wish for "two Indian members of the Viceroy's Executive Council". This shows that ~~and~~ the acceptability within both sources but the conclusion of source 10 stating it was not in "the same liberal spirit as it was conceived" ~~it~~ makes it ~~not~~ weight shift to disagreeing with the statement the Indians found the reforms "acceptable".

In conclusion, sources 10 and 11 give the impression that the Indian people did not find the Morley-Minto Reforms "acceptable" - although 10 does admit some benefits (mainly to keep on Britain's good side). While source 12 disagrees that the Indians found it acceptable - specifically the Muslims. Yet, no source looks at Indians from lower classes which might have found the reforms acceptable (hinted in R 11 - "these reforms destroy the influence of the educated classes" - hinting they were placated. Moreover, none

((a) continued) look at other religions interpretations of the reforms (eg. Sikhs). Yet, as a whole the sources seem to weigh more towards ~~the~~ disagreeing that the Indian people found the Morely-Purito reforms "acceptable".



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response achieves level 4 for this question. The answer clearly understands a range of nuances that can be deduced from the source and clearly uses the sources as a set to reach measured conclusions and judgements in relation to the question focus.

Question 2 (b) (i)

This question was answered by about half of the candidates, the vast majority of whom found the sources accessible and were able to use them as the basis of their response, although Source 15 tended not to be used as fully as it could have been. Some very impressive answers were seen to this question where candidates took the issues raised by the sources and developed them with excellent own knowledge to produce measured judgements which directly responded to the focus of the question.

Weaker answers often tended to engage in extensive description of Gandhi's actions, often with little reference to the chronological parameters imposed by the question. Even where such descriptive approaches did have some focus on Gandhi's strengths and weaknesses, these arguments were often not directly linked to the precise focus of the question as to whether or not his methods were effective in challenging British rule.

It was disappointing to note that once again this year many candidates were still making generic points, some at great length, regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b. This issue has been highlighted in previous reports, but the continuing practice disadvantages candidates who spend time that would be more usefully spent on focusing on the question.

1919-1930
Answer EITHER part (b) (i) OR part (b) (ii) of your chosen question.

(b) (i) ~~Source 13~~ ^{Gandhi} did have a strong impact on the relationship between India and Britain and on Hind-Muslim relationships. His policies of peaceful resistance and the salt march itself in 1930 had an immense social and political impact internationally and within India. As source 13 states "Gandhi's methods were a powerful combination of spiritual strength, political skill and sheer theatricality". However, ~~these~~ Gandhi's campaigns often shifted into violent anti-European attacks, as source 15 states "The murder of policemen in Chauri Charura, and its consequences made us examine the implications of non-violence as a method".

By 1919, ~~near~~ ~~had~~ ~~to~~ World War one had been settled. Indians wanted something in return for their war effort. In War World One ~~Indians~~ Indians met war with instant loyalty. 1.5 million

volunteers went to war and £ 240 million pounds were devoted to war effort. In return, the Raj simply ~~gave~~^{told} Indians an ~~indefinite time~~ ~~for~~ they would someday earn self-determination. This outraged many Indians, ~~and~~ and joined with the proclamation of the Rowatt act in 1919 made Indians make massive demonstrations.

((b) continued) As told in Source 14, "there was a strong element of coercion in his tactics". This is corroborated by Source 13, when Tim Leadbeater denotes that "His various campaigns drew international attention because of the complex problems they caused the British". This shows us that ~~Gandhi's~~^{Gandhi's} campaigns such as the Salt March in 1930 did cause problems to British rule in India. The Salt March was when ~~the~~ Gandhi³ decided to march 240 miles to Dandi in protest of the 4% tax imposed on Salt. Once in Dandi he made his own salt along with thousands of followers all around India. 29,000 were imprisoned along with Gandhi and Nehru. Source 15 further corroborates that "Gandhi's arguments for the ~~stop~~ suspension of civil resistance were correct. This is ~~once~~ once again alliterated in Source 13 when it states that "his campaigns exposed the fact that ~~the~~ the Empire survived because of Indian support and if that was withdrawn, it could not continue." x

However, Gandhi's influence, as said in source 14, "has probably been exaggerated; his influence, even in Congress was far from supreme". In addition, Gandhi's movements ^{((b) continued)} were easily crushed by the Raj. Source 15 corroborates this when it states that even if ~~at~~ Gandhi's civil resistance ideas were correct "opponents would ~~have~~ always have the power to create the circumstance that would result in our abandoning the struggle". This was hewed in the 1930 civil disobedience campaign when people, once Gandhi was in jail, stopped the campaign ~~because~~ because they had to re-enter society. Source 13 also states that Gandhi's measures were "often unsuccessful in their precise objectives". This is realiterated by source 15 when, despite the campaign intending to be passive and peaceful, "the murder of policemen in Chauri Chaura, and its consequences made us examine the implications of non-violence."

In ~~the~~ conclusion, we can observe that source 13 was drafted by Tim Leadbeater, a British man, in the 21st century. This means that, although he ~~was~~ would have had a wide image of the ~~s~~ situation, he wouldn't be as knowladgable as Jawaharlal Nehru, who was an Indian member of ~~the~~ Congress

* ~~at~~ The Gandhi Irwin pact further showed

((b) continued) the immense influence Gandhi had * at the time. In addition, source 14 was drafted by Alan Farmer and it is an extract of a book published in 1992. The fact that sources 13 and 14 were published ~~many~~ many years later ~~but~~ and are made for the public means that they would ~~be~~ be pro Raj. However, Nehru was nationalist and knew Gandhi personally because they worked together so ~~that~~ source 15 would have more historical weight. As a conclusion ~~we~~ ^{it} can be judged that although in some occasions Gandhi's purposes weren't met, he did have a massive influence in ~~the~~ India at the time and he did cause huge problems ~~to~~ British rule in India in the years 1919-30.

* as a Indian wearing dhoti clothes was having a one-to-one meeting with the most important British person by the time. Furthermore in 1929, when the Simon Commission was held, Gandhi's decision to not cooperate with Sir Simon and his Commissars was respected by Congress and most members of the Muslim League.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response does not always focus clearly on the precise question that has been set. There are some descriptive passages within the answer, some of which are not fully relevant. However, there is also some attempt to link some of the material to the question, and for that reason, this response can access level 3 in AO1. The use of sources is less effective; there is evidence of quotes being lifted out of context and no credit is awarded for AO2a comments as this question tests AO2b. For AO2, therefore, this response is level 2.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

This question tests AO2b so that AO2a comments on provenance earn no credit and waste valuable time.

Question 2 (b) (ii)

This question was answered by about half of the candidates, most of whom found the sources accessible and were able to use them effectively to draw out a range of points and to create a debate about the issues. Source 17 proved to be the most difficult for some candidates who failed to recognise that it actually suggests that the war delayed independence rather than acted as an impetus towards it.

However, most candidates also recognised that it offered an alternative explanation for independence in the development of nationalism. There was some impressive own knowledge on the impact of war, with the best answers using this knowledge in combination with the sources to arrive at securely reasoned responses. Weaker candidates often approached the question on a source by source basis, relying heavily on the sources for information. A small number of responses were seen which made very limited reference to the impact of war.

It was disappointing to note that once again this year many candidates were still making generic points, some at great length, regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b. This issue has been highlighted in previous reports, but the continuing practice disadvantages candidates who spend time that would be more usefully spent on focusing on the question.

Answer EITHER part (b) (i) OR part (b) (ii) of your chosen question.

(b) The impact of the Second World War almost crushed the British economically, socially and politically. It is unsurprising that such a drain led the British to grant independence to India, as explored in source 16 clearly and to a lesser extent in source 18. Yet source 18 also alludes to other reasons such as the economic drain the sub-continent was having on Britain. While source 17 also explores the progress of nationalism as another factor, and what none of the sources alludes to is the Labour governments switching loyalties. Yet it is undeniable the impact of the war was the paramount factor in the granting of independence to India.

As source 16 implies "Would the Labour government have offered independence to India if Britain had not been weakened by war?" The extent of the impact of the Second World War was so great that it supports this saying the Labour government "had little

choice". Britain was in £2.3 billion worth of debt and had to rebuild the country. Moreover as Source 18 states India was to "become a running sore which will sap the strength of the British Empire". This might seem hyperbolic considering Warrell, an independence supporter was writing to Churchill, a well known Imperialist who called (b) continued) India the "jewel in the crown of the British Empire." Yet Warrell's statement is supported by ~~keye~~ Keynes's economic evaluation that India was draining £1 billion a year from the British Empire and post the Second World War he expected that figure to rise to £1.4 billion a year. This shows the British could no longer afford to keep ~~the~~ Indians ~~to~~ running as part of their empire after the strains of the Second World War, and was the real reason for granting independence.

Closely linked is the factor that India was no longer economically viable to Britain. In 1931 they had created the Indian National Bank and the rupee was no longer tied to the pound. Moreover Japanese and US goods were becoming huge competition for British goods in the region meaning falling exports (from 1919-1939 exports fell by £44 million.) Lancashire cotton - the symbol of imperialist economic and industrial dominance also collapsed by the end of the Second World War meaning all economic incentive for the British to control

India was fast playing a second-to-main role in its grant of independence at midnight on the 14th of August 1947.

((b) continued) The sources also attribute growing nationalism and "considerable progress towards self rule" for Britain's decision to grant Indian independence. Source 17 argues the 1935 Government of India Act and the 1937 "new constitution" allowed the nationalists to make significant steps towards self rule. The election of 1937 - where Congress won 81/111 seats on the provincial council also supports this as they the country had a dominant political party ready to take the lead, or "control the governments" (Source 17). Yet, source 16 argues "Acts of 1919 and 1935 were introduced to prolong the empire (...). Britain introduced ~~nationalist~~ political liberalisation in response to nationalist pressures." This undermines Source 17's argument entirely and is supported by the British "crackdown" of the 1932 Non-Cooperation movement - placing 100,000 members of Congress in jail and almost outlawing the entire party. Therefore, it can be argued that unlike Source 17 states "it was not nationalist progress which made Britain grant independence and the war did not "disrupt and complicate any smooth transfer of power" it caused the transfer of power.

Source 18 also alludes the pressure of "World Opinion"

((b) continued) which Warel is using to sway Churchill into granting independence. Specifically, the WAF deplored Britain's imperialist nature and often pressured Mem into granting independence - such as the Atlantic Charter (1941) and Britain's deployment of the ~~same~~ Cripps Mission and the August Offer (1940) all acting towards independence. Yet this can also be linked to the Second World War, because the only reason Churchill was approving of these steps towards independence was to ensure the USA's help and aid during the Second World War (Lend-Lease 1939-1945) and their military and economic support. As source 16 states Britain was "weakened by war" and could not do it on its own. The war caused Britain to be subjugated to political pressure on two fronts - from the Americans and the Indians - and even domestically (Source 18) "British people will not consent to be associated with a policy of repression." Aiding the argument that Britain was being pressured "worldwide" (Source 18) to grant independence.

In conclusion, although source 17 argues that it was the rise of ~~the~~ Indian Nationalism and its progress (due to figures such as

((b) continued) Gandhi and his non-cooperation movements (in 1919, 1921, 1930, 1932 and 1942) and source 16 alludes to world wide pressure. In reality it was the impacts of World War Two as stated in source 16 which caused the British to switch their policy from one of placating politics to "put off independence indefinitely" (Source 16) to one of granting independence. Realistically, although Indians themselves might interpret it otherwise and attribute independence to their nationalist efforts, the British Empire would not have given up almost a century of rule of a nation if it had not been weakened economically to the extent that it could no longer ~~rule~~ economically accommodate its rule, and



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a strong level 4 response in both assessment objectives.

It uses the sources to shape the response and supports the issues raised in the sources by some very impressive own knowledge.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

All Questions

- Candidates should proof read their answers at the end of the examination, and correct any instances where they have incorrectly labelled a source, used the wrong names or the wrong dates.
- Too many candidates are using certain phrases, such as 'using the sources as a set', as a substitute for actually engaging in the task that they are claiming.
- Engaging with the sources needs to go beyond accepting the content at face value and to test it for validity considering provenance in part a and by testing the opinions in part b with knowledge set in the context of the period.

Part A

1. Candidates should spend sufficient time reading the sources to ensure that they understand the nuances of the arguments presented.
2. Candidates should treat the sources as a package in order to facilitate cross referencing. Weaker candidates work through sources sequentially. Such responses cannot go beyond level 2.
3. Provenance should be integrated within the argument and decisions need to be made on the relative strengths and weaknesses of the sources.

The attributes of the sources should be discussed, not described. This aids the use of provenance as part of the argument. Candidates should avoid making stereotypical comments about the provenance that could apply to any source and avoid labelling a source as both reliable and unreliable and thus negating any conclusions drawn.

The key to a successful response is the ability to weigh the sources to reach a final judgement.

4. The best responses cross reference not only the content of the sources, but also their provenance. This enables candidates to weigh the sources and reach supported judgements.
5. There are no marks available for knowledge in part a.

Candidates should avoid arguing from their knowledge since it cannot be credited and often impacts on the amount of time they have available to complete part b.

Part B

1. Candidates need to ensure that their subject knowledge conforms to the specification. Weaker responses usually relied very heavily on information derived primarily from the sources.
2. In order to address the question effectively, candidates need to offer an analysis driven by the arguments raised in the sources.

Sources should be used to develop lines of argument and reasoning rather than used for information to develop a descriptive answer.

3. Whilst it may be relevant to use the provenance of the contemporary source(s) to judge the weight that can be assigned to the argument, there is no such requirement for the secondary sources and it is not rewarded in A02b. Many candidates still engage in generalised comments that a particular historian is or is not reliable at the expense of developing argument and analysis tested by specific own knowledge.

4. Candidates need to ensure that they are aware of the focus of the question and the time period specified and that they maintain the focus throughout their answer, to avoid straying into irrelevant areas that cannot be rewarded.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.