



Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2023

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced
Level in History (WHI02/1A)

Paper 2: Breadth Study with Source
Evaluation

Option 1A: India, 1857–1948: The Raj
to Partition

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

January 2023

Publication Code: WHI02_1A_ms_2301

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

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.

Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 2

Section A: Question 1(a)

Target: AO2 (10 marks): Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included but presented as information rather than applied to the source material. • Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little substantiation. The concept of value may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	4–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material, but mainly to expand or confirm matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and with some substantiation for assertions of value. The concept of value is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	7–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences. • Sufficient knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences, as well as to expand or confirm matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and based on valid criteria although justification is not fully substantiated. Explanation of value takes into account relevant considerations such as the nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author.

Section A: Question 1(b)

Target: AO2 (15 marks): Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, but presented as information rather than applied to the source material. • Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little supporting evidence. The concept of reliability may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis, by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material but mainly to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. The concept of reliability is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	8–11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences. • Detailed knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of weight takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria, with some justification.
4	12–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion. • Deploys well-selected knowledge of the historical context, but mainly to illuminate or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material. Displays some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may not be fully substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.

Section B

Target: AO1 (25 marks): Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
1	1–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic. • Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question. • The overall judgement is missing or asserted. • There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	7–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question. • An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit. • The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	13–18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although some mainly descriptive passages may be included. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth. • Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. • The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.
4	19–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands. • Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported. • The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision.

Section A: Indicative content

Option 1A: India, 1857–1948: The Raj to Partition

Question	Indicative content
1a	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme.</p> <p>The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are required to analyse the source and consider its value for an enquiry into the significance of the Royal Proclamation of 1858 in the governing of India.</p> <p>1. The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides evidence that Britain was to rule India directly ('the Proclamation by which the Queen's direct supremacy over India is finally achieved. The rule of the East India Company has been replaced.') • It claims that the Royal Proclamation is of great significance in the governing of India ('this Proclamation is one of the greatest documents that has ever appeared in this country') • It implies that the changes under the Proclamation will be beneficial for Indians ('confirms treaties, guarantees toleration ... promises to introduce reforms') • It claims that the Proclamation is uniformly popular ('there is only one opinion and that is in favour of the Proclamation'). <p>2. The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The letter was written by the Bombay reporter who was present in India and able to witness reactions to the Proclamation at first-hand • The letter offers an immediate reaction to the significance of the Proclamation, being written a week after it was issued • The letter represents the reaction of the educated classes to the Proclamation ('My view is the same view as most educated men in India'). <p>3. Knowledge of the historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Royal Proclamation declared that authority in India passed from the East India Company to Queen Victoria. Her powers would be exercised through a governor-general who took the title of viceroy • Educated Indians regarded British rule as helpful to the social and

Question	Indicative content
	<p>economic development of India</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proclamation recognised the different religious sensitivities in India in the wake of the Mutiny and laid the foundations for recognition of separate political rights for different religious communities. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
1b	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme.</p> <p>The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are required to analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into the response of the Government of India to the 1899 famine in India.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lord Curzon was in charge of the Government of India and was in an excellent position to assess what actions his government had taken to deal with the famine The date of the statement means that Curzon is able to assess both the immediate and later responses taken by his government The content and tone of the source suggest that Curzon was defensive about the response taken by his government As the person responsible for the Government of India during the famine, Curzon would tend to give a positive assessment of the actions taken. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It suggests that the Government of India had been criticised for its initial response ('the position taken up by the Government of India in the first months of the famine...was consistent.') It implies that the Government response was effective in dealing with the effects of the famine ('permitted a vast extension of free relief', 'open small village works to replace the deserted public works relief camps')

Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It claims that the nature of the response had to be informed by the cost to the taxpayer ('insisted on relief being administered with the care and method which we owe to the taxpayer.') It claims that it had spared no expense in saving lives ('accept any expenditure which was required to save life'). <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of the content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Curzon's government organised famine relief for subjects of British provinces. However, the native princes of Rajputana and Gujarat were responsible for their provinces, and the response was less effective there The famine relief in the British Provinces was organised by Lord Curzon's government and around 25 per cent of the affected people received relief The British initiatives were inadequate because no intervention was made to control the grain prices in the relief measures implemented The Famine Commission of 1901 criticised the Government of India for failing to have public works ready at the beginning of the famine. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Section B: Indicative content

Option 1A: India, 1857–1948: The Raj to Partition

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether a negative relationship between the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League continued throughout the years 1906-20.</p> <p>The arguments and evidence that a negative relationship between the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League continued throughout the years 1906-20 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Muslim League, established in 1906, was an anti-Congress body. The relationship between the Muslim League and the INC was always affected by fears that the majority Hindus would deny Muslims a political voice The Muslim League tended to be far more accommodating to the British

	<p>Raj in pursuing its goal of separate electorates. This made the INC suspicious of the League and led to a generally negative relationship</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Muslim League was disappointed by the 1911 revision of Bengal's boundaries, which was carried out to appease the Hindu majority. Thus, frosty relations between the Muslim League and the INC continued • In 1920, the negative relationship was made evident when the Muslim League criticised the Non-Cooperation Movement led by Gandhi and approved unanimously by the INC. <p>The arguments and evidence that a negative relationship between the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League did not continue throughout the years 1906-20 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many members of the Muslim League had originally been members of the INC and they continued to work with the INC on issues relating to self-government in the years 1906-20 • Relations improved significantly in 1915 when the INC and the Muslim League held concurrent meetings and agreed a common political objective of self-government. This was enshrined in the Lucknow Pact of 1916 • The INC and the Muslim League were united in their condemnation of the Rowlatt Acts of 1919 • Gandhi's support for the Khilafat Movement helped to win support from leading members of the Muslim League for the 1920 Non-Cooperation Movement, e.g. Maulana Muhammad Ali. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>
--	---

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether the Irwin Declaration (1929) was the most significant factor in progress towards self-government in India in the years 1909-35.</p> <p>The arguments and evidence that the Irwin Declaration (1929) was the most significant factor in progress towards self-government in India in the years 1909-</p>

35 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The Irwin Declaration was significant because it reiterated the commitments made in the Montagu Declaration (1917) that the British government would eventually grant India some form of self-government
- The Irwin Declaration made the important statement that the attainment of dominion status would be the natural development for India in its progress towards self-government
- Whilst the Irwin Declaration left viceregal and military matters in British hands, it facilitated significant progress towards self-government by stating that provincial government would be entirely Indian
- The Irwin Declaration was important because it paved the way to the Gandhi-Irwin Pact (1931) that brought the civil disobedience campaign to an end and enabled Gandhi to attend the second Round Table Conference.

The arguments and evidence that the Irwin Declaration (1929) was not the most significant/there were other, more significant factors in progress towards self-government in India in the years 1909-35 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The impact of the Irwin Declaration was very limited. Although it paved the way for the Round Table Conferences, both ended without any progress on Indian self-government
- The Indian Councils Act, 1909 was significant in making progress towards self-government because it provided for the indirect election of Indians to councils and set the precedent for separate electorates for Muslims
- The Government of India Act 1919 was significant because it confirmed the promise of eventual self-government of India by an Indian parliament
- The Government of India Act 1935 made significant progress towards self-government. It provided for an eventual federation, extended the vote and created provincial governments with legislative and executive powers.

Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether, in the years 1935-47, the failure of the Cabinet Mission (1946) was the main reason why India was eventually partitioned in 1947.</p> <p>The arguments and evidence that in the years 1935-47, the failure of the Cabinet Mission (1946) was the main reason why India was eventually partitioned in 1947 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Cabinet Mission's proposal to establish regional clusters of provincial governments provided for Muslim-dominated areas. The basis of Partition with an independent Pakistan was inherent within the proposal • The split between the INC and the Muslim League deepened after Nehru withdrew his objections to the May Statement, in response to the Cabinet Mission's decision to select all members of the interim government • Nehru's statement that an All-India Union controlled by Congress could repudiate the terms of the Cabinet Mission alarmed Jinnah, especially as Cripps did not deny Nehru's claims that the idea of Pakistan would die • Jinnah's rejection of the Cabinet Mission's proposals and call for a Day of Action in August 1946 ensured both the failure of the Mission and Muslim rejection of a Hindu-dominated All-India as the outcome of independence. <p>The arguments and evidence that there were other, more important reasons why India was eventually partitioned in 1947 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The seeds of Partition were built into the Government of India Act 1935. The Act provided for separate electorates, which were the precursor to Muslim control of the provinces where they dominated • The 1937 elections, where Congress swept the board, convinced Jinnah that a united India would be dominated by Hindus and that, in the long run, only a separate Pakistan could guarantee the right of Muslims • In March 1940, the Lahore Resolution demanded a separate Pakistan. The Muslim League was co-operative during the war in order to secure approval for Pakistan, e.g. its acceptance of the Cripps Mission in 1942 • In spite of Mountbatten's desire to achieve independence with a united India, the outbreak of communal violence in 1946-47 convinced him that only Partition could solve the problems arising from independence.

	Other relevant material must be credited.
--	---