

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2014

GCE History (6HI02/D)

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by 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.

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

Summer 2014

Publications Code US039086

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

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.

<p>3</p>	<p>13-18</p>	<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>
<p>4</p>	<p>19-24</p>	<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 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 are likely to begin by an examination of Source 1 as this offers the strongest support for the view that the British response to the Easter Rising was characterised by excessive force. This does not see the men as 'rebels', but rather says that they were actually 'prisoners of war' and should therefore not have been summarily shot. This might be contrasted to Source 3's comment that the men had been 'shot under decrees of courts-martial', which could be used to counter Source 1's claim that the shooting was 'in cold blood'. Alternatively, candidates might argue that as 'prisoners of war' (Source 1), being 'shot under decrees of courts-martial' (Source 3) does suggest the use of excessive force. Either approach should be credited according to the way in which it is argued. By linking the 'rebels' to Germany money Source 2 suggests that this was a legitimate punishment, especially in time of war, rather than the use of excessive force. This approach appears to be supported by the arguments in another newspaper, the Daily News, which is quoted in Source 1. Candidates might comment on the fact that two newspaper reports appear to be in broad agreement about the support of executions. The only overt criticism that Source 2 makes of the approach taken by the British government is that it did not make the reason for its actions clear; the actions themselves are not subject to criticism. Overall though, the view in Source 2 contrasts strongly to the view presented by the author of Source 1. Sources 1 and 3 are clearly in agreement on one key issue. Source 3 says that the executions 'aroused bitterness' and this can certainly be seen in both the tone and the content of the letter in Source 1. However, Source 3 is clearly very grateful to Asquith for his intervention in preventing more executions and Source 2 seems to support Source 3 in being relieved that there were to be no more executions. Candidates could develop this agreement in several different ways to discuss whether the British response did involve the use of excessive force or not. The fact that Healy was writing to his brother would suggest that his gratitude was genuine and this might affect the way that candidates approach their line of argument. Candidates are likely to consider the provenance of these sources within their line of argument and any sensible comments that elucidate the differing perspectives should be credited.</p> <p>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 British authorities responded to the 1916 Easter Rising with excessive force.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (i)	<p>The focus of the question is the role played by Parnell in the cause of Irish nationalism. Candidates are likely to begin by considering some of the arguments to be found in Source 4 which supports the view in the question. It points to two key achievements in the political field that the source argues are the most important aspects of his achievement – his role in bringing Home Rule to the forefront of politics and his role in creating the IPP. Candidates are likely to develop both of these themes on the basis of their contextual own knowledge. Candidates need to weigh the importance of these achievements against his contribution before 1882. Source 5 and Source 6 can both be used to develop this part of the argument. Source 5 suggests that Parnell’s contribution as a leading member of the Land League was significant because it resulted in giving tenants ‘what they had long craved’ in the 1881 Land Act. This is further elaborated upon in Source 6 which is very enthusiastic in its praise for the work done by Parnell before 1882. Candidates could develop this line of argument by discussing exactly what Parnell did to advance land reform by reference to contextual own knowledge. This view could be contrasted with Source 4 which also refers to Parnell’s work in this field, but which sees it as less significant than his political contributions. Source 6, on the other hand, seems to suggest that Parnell did little of merit after 1882 as it sees the Kilmainham Treaty as a ‘political defeat’. Candidates could develop this line of argument by reference to the fatal split with Chamberlain in 1885, the failure of Home Rule in 1886 and the later splits in the Nationalist Party over the O’Shea divorce case and the failure of the 2nd Home Rule Bill. 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 Parnell was more significant after 1882 than he had been before 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
<p>1 (b) (ii)</p>	<p>The focus of the question is the impact of the cultural revival of the late 19th century. Candidates are likely to begin by developing a number of the arguments contained in Source 7 from which the statement is drawn. It states that the Gaelic League 'fortified nationalism'. This might be linked to Hyde's statement in Source 9 that there was a possibility that the organisation ran the 'risk of encouraging national aspirations', although this was not its aim. This too links to Source 7 as it does state in the opening line that the 'political impact' was not necessarily an intended consequence. Candidates could build on their contextual own knowledge to examine a range of political activities that nationalists were engaged in during the latter part of the 19th century and link these to the focus of the question. Source 7 also refers to the Gaelic Athletic Association. Candidates might use their own contextual knowledge to demonstrate how this organisation used its activities to achieve the 'military and political potential' that is referred to in the source. Candidates might also make use of broader contextual knowledge to show how the Gaelic League contained many of those who would go on to be leading nationalists e.g. Pádraig Pearse was the first editor of the League's newspaper. Source 8 and Source 9 both deal directly with the Gaelic League. Source 8 clearly challenges the view in the question as it states that the organisation aimed to be 'non-political', focusing only on the language. Support for this can be found in the words of Hyde himself which are presented in Source 9 when he argues that the organisation is fundamentally above politics. This in itself could be argued by candidates as evidence for it being political, insofar as it aimed to unite both Unionists and Nationalists. Candidates might draw on broader contextual knowledge to discuss other elements of the cultural revival that are not directly referenced in the sources, such as the development of the Abbey Theatre. 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 the cultural revival of the late 19th century had a 'significant political impact' 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 looking at Source 12 which is most in agreement with the view that Gandhi's poor political skills were a major problem. It is particularly critical of his claim to speak for all of India. Candidates may comment that because this was written considerably later as memoirs, that Moraes is influenced by the events surrounding partition. However, Source 11 also deals with the relationship between Gandhi and the Muslims at the Conference and suggests that he should have reached a 'settlement with the Muslims' and that his failure to do so represented the loss of 'the biggest opportunity of his life'. This source is much closer in time to the events that are being discussed, so that the fact that Sources 11 and 12 agree with each other might be argued to add weight to their views. Gandhi speaking in Source 10 is, unsurprisingly perhaps, less critical of himself in this respect. He states in the press statement, where he will want to be presenting events positively, that 'I tried to act as an intermediary', although he does acknowledge that he has not had much success in this. Source 11 and Source 12 also both agree on the role played by another factor in influencing the outcome of the Second Round Table Conference, namely the role played by Congress. Source 11 argues that the 'Hindus' had an 'uncompromising attitude' which would make it difficult for Gandhi to effectively negotiate. Source 12 makes it clear that the decision that Gandhi should be the 'sole representative' at the Round Table Conference was taken by Congress and that it was a 'disastrous misjudgement'. Thus, Source 11 and Source 12 seem to link the responsibility for the difficulties facing the Second Round Table Conference to both Gandhi and to Congress. Source 10 identifies an alternative reason for the difficulties, the role of the British government. The source suggests that it was their fault for the 'composition' of the Conference and for insisting on the 'settlement of the Hindu-Muslim question'. Although it might be argued that this was a negotiating position made in a press statement that would be read by members of the British government, there is some support for this view to be found in Source 11, which suggests that behind the scenes, the British government was using 'divide and rule' principles. In view of Source 11's generally critical view of Gandhi and the INC, it might be argued that there could be some truth in this view. Candidates are likely to consider the provenance of the sources within their line of argument and any sensible comments that elucidate the differing perspectives should be credited.</p> <p>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 main reason for the failure of the Second Round Table Conference was Gandhi's poor political skills.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (i)	<p>The focus of the question is the reasons for the growth of Indian nationalism 1900-19. Evidence to support the view presented in the question can be found in Source 13 and Source 14. Source 13 deals with the earlier part of the period and refers to 'the suppression of public meetings' and 'the growing oppression of the peasants' as part of a pattern of growing misuse of power by the British. Source 13 suggests that such behaviour was likely to increase the demand for self-government among Indians. Candidates may, however, question how extensive this pattern was as Keir Hardie only visited India for a short period. By using contextual knowledge of the events of the early period, such as developing the reference to the partition of Bengal, candidates can test the validity of Source 13's argument. Source 14 deals with the later part of the period, focusing on the Rowlatt Acts and Amritsar. It makes it very clear that both repression and the British response to it had a clear impact on the development of Indian nationalism. Candidates are likely to work Source 13 and Source 14 together and combine them with additional material based on contextual own knowledge to demonstrate how repression contributed to the growth of Indian nationalism in the period. Some candidates may use the findings of the Hunter Commission to offer an alternative view of events. This should be credited appropriately. Source 15 offers an entirely different explanation for the growth of nationalism in this period. It implies that the key factor in encouraging Indian nationalism was the impact of World War I and argues that the war led to Congress and the Muslim League being drawn into a 'common cause'. Candidates should be able to develop the ways in which the war impacted on the growth of nationalism further on the basis of their contextual own knowledge. Some candidates might also infer from this source that there was widespread support for the British as so many Indians were part of the 'volunteer army'. They might use this as the basis to challenge how extensive repression was or alternatively they might argue such support was undermined by the events that followed the war. Candidates who consider other reasons for the development of nationalism on the basis of their contextual own knowledge should be rewarded accordingly. 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 British repression was responsible for the growth of Indian nationalism 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
<p>2 (b) (ii)</p>	<p>The focus of the question is the role played by Jinnah in the partition of India. Candidates might begin by an examination of Source 16, the Lahore Declaration, which some historians have argued laid out the basis for the future state of Pakistan. It is an ambiguous statement (as noted by Source 17) and candidates might use their contextual own knowledge to show that even Muslims interpreted it in different ways. Candidates are likely to link their use of Source 16 to Source 17. This suggests that Jinnah was behaving 'tactically', specifically in the way in which he left the terms of the Lahore Declaration vague so that it could be used to achieve a range of different outcomes. From this perspective, candidates might argue that it was the way in which Jinnah manipulated the political system that was to lead to partition and that he was therefore responsible for it. Candidates could also use their own contextual knowledge to identify other aspects of Jinnah's approach which can be regarded in the same light e.g. his approach to the Second World War which gave rise to the August Offer. Source 18 acknowledges 'Jinnah's success' but also highlights the 'blunders' of Congress as a key factor in the move towards partition. Source 18 sees the key 'blunder' as the rejection of the Cabinet Mission's proposals on which Jinnah appeared to be prepared to compromise. Candidates might elaborate on this on the basis of their contextual own knowledge and/or add additional detail of further examples of 'blunders' made by Congress, especially in the period after 1940 e.g. the Quit India Campaign. There are a considerable number of valid routes through this question and all should be rewarded according to the quality of argument and supporting evidence, derived from contextual knowledge. Some candidates may focus primarily on the issues generated by the sources; others may look at some of the longer-term factors that link the partition of India to events from before the outbreak of World War II and others may incorporate the role played by Mountbatten and the escalating descent into inter-communal violence in the process of partition. 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 Jinnah was responsible for the partition of India 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>

