

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE in History
(6HI02) Paper 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, please visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

Our website subject pages hold useful resources, support material and live feeds from our subject advisors giving you access to a portal of information. If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

www.edexcel.com/contactus

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

Summer 2016

Publications Code 43887

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

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.

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: A02a (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 own knowledge with material drawn from sources, although this may not be sustained throughout the response. The selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 4: 23-24 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 4.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes may not be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing but there may be passages which lack clarity or coherence. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p>

A02b (16 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-4	<p>Comprehends the sources and selects material relevant to the representation contained in the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-4 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	5-8	<p>Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify points which support or differ from the representation contained in the question. When supporting the decision made in relation to the question the sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 7-8 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	9-12	<p>The sources are analysed and points of challenge and/or support for the representation contained in the question are developed from the provided material. In addressing the specific enquiry, there is clear awareness that a representation is under discussion and there is evidence of reasoning from the evidence of 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 to both support and challenge the claim in the question. Candidates may begin by reference to Source 2, from which the statement in the question is drawn, which argues that the RIC has come under great provocation and that at least some of the violence could therefore be regarded as ‘acts of justifiable self-defence’. The source argues that there had been some ‘misrepresentation’ of what was going on and this view could be supported by reference to Source 3. Although Source 3 suggests that it was the police who had first come under attack (via its reference to the villagers being killed in ‘revenge’), it portrays their reaction in a negative light – ‘terror’, ‘victim’. Published only a week after the speech made in Source 2, Source 3 seems to confirm much of what is said, but its tone shows a very different perception of events which is far more critical of the actions than the defence of those actions in Source 2. Such a position could be supported by reference to one part of Source 2. Greenwood admits that there had been ‘cases in which unjustifiable action has undoubtedly been taken’; candidates may possibly view the events described in Source 3 as one example of this. Candidates are likely to comment on the provenance of each source in order to establish what weight the arguments can bear. They may well feel that Source 2 was likely to put a positive spin on events, particularly if Greenwood anticipated the wide reporting of the speech and was acknowledging that there were issues to be addressed. Candidates may feel that Source 3 is more likely to try to take an objective view of the events being observed. However, any valid line of argument should be credited. Source 1 could be used by candidates to support Source 2’s view that there was provocation, and hence that the use of violence could be justified. On the other hand, Source 1 refers to the actions of the RIC and these could be supported by reference to the description of the village in Source 3 and used to argue the counter point. Candidates are likely to discuss the purpose of this source and any relevant line of argument should be credited. Any valid conclusion that is drawn by candidates should be credited. 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 about whether the use of violence by the Royal Irish Constabulary and the Black and Tans in 1920 was ‘justifiable self-defence’.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (i)	<p>The focus of the question is the extent to which agitation by Irish nationalists in the years 1867-85 amounted to a challenge to British rule. Candidates are likely to begin by reference to Source 4, which offers direct support for the view by its commentary on the actions of the Fenians in the 1860s. They are likely to draw on their own contextual knowledge of events, such as the battle of Ridgeway and the Fenian risings in Chester and Kerry, to support the view that the Fenians were not engaged in ‘serious revolutionary ventures’ and therefore did not really pose a challenge. Although the cartoon in Source 6 shows Gladstone being challenged by the Land League, the caption to the cartoon may be used to suggest that he has the threat under control – ‘there is a way of resisting it’. Candidates who comment appropriately on the provenance of the source as being from an English satirical magazine should be credited. The counter argument can be found in all 3 sources to a greater or lesser extent, although candidates are likely to begin by reference to Source 5, which suggests that the actions of Parnell and the Land League would bring about both agrarian and political reform by putting pressure on the government. This line of argument could be developed in a range of different ways on the basis of the candidates’ contextual own knowledge and any appropriate line of argument should be rewarded. Source 4 could be used to suggest that the British authorities were slow to learn from the experience of the past and point out the possible impact of this. Source 6 also can be used to support the counter argument; candidates may point to the range of strategies used by the Irish nationalists and shown in the tentacles and view these as potentially dangerous to British rule. The best answers will be aware that Fenianism and Parnell’s involvement with the Land League entailed different issues and to discuss this appropriately. 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 extent to which agitation by Irish nationalists in the years 1867-85 amounted to a challenge to British rule, 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 the reasons for the crisis over the 3rd Home Rule Bill in the years 1912-1914. The sources offer two distinct interpretations for this – the factor suggested in the question and the role played by Asquith. Candidates are likely to begin by an examination of Source 7 which offers support to the view in the question. It suggests that the Conservative opposition to Home Rule was motivated by domestic political concerns. The nature of that opposition is expanded upon in Source 8 where Bonar Law himself confirms his desire to ‘force a General Election’ and makes it clear that he was threatening Asquith with certain consequences which would arise if the Liberals continued to push for Home Rule. This could be further supported by reference to Source 9’s comment that Bonar Law was ‘openly advocating sedition in Belfast’. Candidates are likely to develop these arguments on the basis of their contextual own knowledge. One obvious line would be a discussion of the Curragh Mutiny less than 6 months after this conversation. The key counter argument that is presented in the sources is to be found principally in Source 9. This is that the crisis was the consequence of ‘Asquith’s limitations’. This line of argument can be developed using what is in Source 9 as well as referencing the final sentence of Source 8, which implies that Asquith did not respond as vigorously as he ought to Bonar Law’s threats and integrating this with the development of contextual own knowledge. Candidates who comment appropriately on the provenance of Source 8 and his motivations should be rewarded appropriately. All 3 sources imply a third reason for the crisis – namely events in Ulster. Source 7 refers to Edward Carson; Source 8 refers to ‘Ulster in resistance’; Source 9 refers to ‘the private armies that were forming’ and also supports Source 8 by reference to ‘the forces of opposition in Ulster’. This third line of argument could be developed more fully on the basis of contextual own knowledge. 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 for the crisis over the 3rd Home Rule Bill in the years 1912-1914, 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

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 are likely to begin by referencing Source 11 which offers direct support for the view that Gandhi's refusal to compromise was the main reason for the failure of the Mission. As this source so clearly dislikes Gandhi, candidates may question the validity of this position, although it seems to have been shared by at least one other member of the Mission. Candidates are likely to contrast the way in which Gandhi is represented in Source 11 with the moderate and reasonable tone of the comments that he is making in Source 10 and use this as the basis of a counter argument. Some candidates may attempt to explain this difference of approach by reference to the provenance of the sources and any appropriate explanation that is offered should be credited. Both Source 10 and Source 12 offer a clear line of counter argument, namely that the reason for failure was the division between Congress and the Muslim League. Some candidates may suggest that this view is validated because the comments in Source 10 are not necessarily what Gandhi might be expected to say, particularly in light of the comments made about him in Source 11. This view regarding disagreement between Congress and the Muslim League is also supported in Source 12, where Cripps refers to the long time it took to bring the two sides together, implying that there were issues between them. However, it also suggests that there may have been some element of disagreement from the minority groups too. Candidates may approach the provenance of Source 12 in different ways. Some might argue that as this is Cripps' Report to the House of Commons and it would be widely reported, it might be perceived as accurate. Others might suggest that Cripps is trying to justify what has happened. Any appropriate argument that is developed should be rewarded. A further alternative explanation for the failure of the Mission that is implied by Source 12 is that the British were believed to be acting in order to 'frustrate the hopes of Indian independence'. This view is directly countered by Source 10, who could be assumed to be in a position to know, who thought that 'one purpose of the Mission is to end British rule as early as possible'.</p> <p>It is unlikely that candidates will consider all of these issues and due credit should be awarded for the development of valid arguments. 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 about whether the main reason for the failure of the Mission was the inability of Gandhi to compromise.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (i)	<p>The focus of the question is the means that were used by the British to maintain control over India in the years 1900-19. Candidates may begin by referencing Source 13, which could be used to support the view expressed in the question. This letter, written at the start of the period, implies that Indians felt that they could not challenge the military might of the British. The fact that Dyer only took 90 men with him to the Jallianwalla Bagh, as pointed out in Source 15, could be argued to offer some support to this view. Candidates are likely to use their contextual own knowledge about events at Amritsar to develop this point, but it does need to be done in relation to the focus of the question. Weaker candidates may simply describe the events. Although Source 14 agrees that the army is used to deal with unrest, it points out that police are also used. More able candidates may use this distinction to make the point that the numbers available to the military were not sufficient, and therefore that other factors might have played a role. Source 14 actually suggests two other factors – concessions and processions. Source 14 refers to the Morley-Minto reforms, although they are not specifically named. Candidates could use their contextual own knowledge to discuss a wider range of reforms and their use in the maintenance of control; this could include reforms from the Curzon era or the 1918 Government of India Act. Both ‘concessions and processions’ can be argued as creating a mind-set that was predisposed towards British rule. This line of argument could find support from Source 13 which outlines the ways in which British rule has benefitted India. Given that the focus of the question is ‘Britain’s military power’, references to World War I should be credited if they are clearly linked to the focus of the question. 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 means that were used by the British to maintain control over India in the years 1900-19, 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
2 (b) (ii)	<p>The focus of the question is the state of relations between Congress and the Muslim League by the end of the 1920s. The core argument of Source 16 and Source 18 are in complete contrast to each other on the issue. Candidates are likely to begin with a consideration of Source 16 from which the view is taken. Candidates are likely to debate the issue of the significance of separate electorates and develop this on the basis of their contextual own knowledge, possibly going all the way back to the Lucknow Pact. The argument might be extended by reference to the conflicts that were arising at the end of the 1920s between Congress and the Muslim League, most particularly the Nehru Report and the 14 points of Jinnah. Some candidates may also discuss the nature of Hindu-Muslim relations in the 1920s on the basis of their contextual own knowledge and this should be rewarded according to the relevance of the argument to the focus of the question. The counter argument is clearly represented by Source 18 which, whilst it agrees with Source 16 on the issue of the existence of areas of disagreement over separate electorates, suggests that this did not amount to partition being a possibility at that moment. It argues that the key driver towards partition would be Jinnah and, as Source 17 suggests, he appears in the 1920s to have been conciliatory in his overtures to Congress. However, as Source 18 points out, Jinnah ‘made himself a figurehead for Hindu-Muslim unity’ and this speech is an effective example of this. The best candidates are likely to be able to contextualise the speech in Source 17, and point out that it predates the Nehru Report and Jinnah’s response to it in the form of the 14 points and the parting of the ways. Candidates who use Source 18’s reference to the alienation of Jinnah combined with contextual own knowledge to discuss the ways in which he promoted partition after the end of the 1920s, should be rewarded accordingly, although this should not become the sole focus of the question. 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 state of relations between Congress and the Muslim League by the end of the 1920s, 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