

Mark scheme

International Advanced Subsidiary  
in History (WHI02/1A)

Paper 2: Breadth Study with  
Source Evaluation

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

## 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
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little substantiation. The concept of value may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.</li> <li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material, but mainly to expand or confirm matters of detail.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>7–10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences, as well as to expand or confirm matters of detail.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

**Section A: Question 1(b)**

**Target: A02 (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
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little supporting evidence. The concept of reliability may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis, by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.</li> <li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material but mainly to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>8–11</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Detailed knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>12–15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

## Section B

**Target: A01 (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
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>7–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>13–18</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>19–25</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

## Section A: indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
<p><b>1(a)</b></p>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' 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 that is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse the source to consider its value for an enquiry into the extent of communal violence in 1947.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences that could be drawn from and supported by from the source:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It provides evidence of a number of instances of communal violence</li> <li>• It provides evidence that the nature of the violence varied from 'tension' to 'heavy killing'</li> <li>• It provides evidence of the diversity of the attacks – 'village', 'refugee column', 'refugee train'</li> <li>• It suggests that the extent of violence may have been mitigated by 'military force'.</li> </ul> </li> <li>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:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The writer of the telegram is likely to have access to reliable sources of information, whilst the recipient of the telegram would require reliable information about what was happening in the region</li> <li>• The date of the telegram is approximately a month after partition has taken place</li> <li>• The source references only a brief period of time, implying that communal violence would have been more extensive than this</li> <li>• The constant references to secrecy and confidentiality imply that there is a concern about the extent of the communal violence.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The conflicting claims of Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs for territory in the Punjab</li> <li>• The difficulties faced by the Boundary Commission in determining where the frontier between India and Pakistan should be placed in the Punjab, especially in relation to cities such as Lahore and Amritsar</li> <li>• The fears of those who were displaced by partition in August 1947 for their future, leading to the massive movement of population in both directions</li> <li>• The inability of the 50,000 strong British army left in India between August 1947 and mid-1948 to control the extent of the violence.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

Question	Indicative content
<b>1(b)</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' 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 that is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into the reaction in Britain to the Amritsar Massacre.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 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"> <li>• Churchill was a member of the British Government and likely to be well informed about events in India, which is supported by the knowledge of events that is demonstrated</li> <li>• The language used by Churchill suggests that he was morally outraged by events, for example 'a monstrous event'</li> <li>• As Churchill opposed moves towards Indian independence, his criticisms of British behaviour at Amritsar give considerable weight to his views</li> <li>• The need to set up a committee into the events suggests that there was some controversy surrounding them.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It provides evidence that Churchill was critical of the actions taken by the British ('our reign in India or anywhere else has never stood on the basis of physical force alone')</li> <li>• It suggests that not all people in Britain agreed with Churchill's assessment of the events at Amritsar ('I shall be told that it 'saved India''')</li> <li>• It claims that the level of violence was excessive even though the meeting at the Jallianwallah Bagh was 'unlawful'.</li> </ul> </li> <li>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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The findings of the Hunter Committee, with its censuring of the actions of General Dyer and its reprimand of the governor of Punjab, O'Dwyer</li> <li>• The response to the massacre by the ladies of the Punjab who sent a letter to Dyer telling him that he had saved them</li> <li>• The response of the British press to the treatment of Dyer suggests that he had support for his actions in Britain, for example £26,000 fund raised by the Morning Star</li> <li>• The debates that took place in Parliament after the findings of the Hunter Committee were released indicate the level of disagreement – Dyer was censured in the House of Commons but supported in the House of Lords.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

## Section B: indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' 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 that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about how accurate it is to say that, in the years 1857-1914, economic development in India was dictated by Britain's needs.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that in the years 1857-1914, economic development in India was dictated by Britain's needs should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• India was important as a source of raw materials for Britain, for example raw cotton, and jute and the export of these delayed the development of Indian production</li> <li>• Some of the agricultural production in India involved cash crops – and this contributed to the periodic outbreaks of famine in the subcontinent, thus demonstrating the primacy of British needs for these crops above Indian needs for food</li> <li>• Rice was exported to Britain, which further contributed to periodic famine</li> <li>• India was the largest overseas market for the sale of British goods in this period, although this was beginning to decline by the end of the period as Indian industry developed; this enabled the growth of British industry at the expense of Indian industry</li> <li>• Investment opportunities in India were set up in ways that would directly benefit British investors, for example the building of railways began in 1853 with state contracts that guaranteed a return of 5% to British companies who invested.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that counter the view that in the years 1857-1914, economic development in India was dictated by Britain's needs should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• British investment in India's infrastructure, irrigation and industry enabled the Indian economy to grow and develop, for example irrigated land increased eight-fold following the decision to allow the government of India to raise loans for productive purposes in 1871</li> <li>• Indian companies developed, for example the first Tata cotton factory was opened in 1887 and soon followed by its acquisition of iron and steel works</li> <li>• The development of Indian cotton factories in the second half of the 19th century had cost advantages over British factories and, although this was mitigated to a degree by the Factory Act of 1881, India was still the world's 4th largest manufacturer of cotton by 1914.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' 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 that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the extent to which British Government legislation, in the years 1909-35, resulted in a change in India's relationship with Britain.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that British Government legislation, in the years 1909-35, resulted in a change in India's relationship with Britain should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased levels of participation at the highest level: in 1909, white officials outnumbered Indians on the Viceroy's Executive Council; in 1919 the numbers advising the Viceroy equalised and in 1935 the Viceroy's Executive Committee was largely Indian</li> <li>• Under each piece of successive legislation provincial councils were enlarged and given increasing levels of responsibility so that by 1935 they controlled almost everything except defence and foreign policy</li> <li>• There was a shift in perception at each new piece of legislation that India was moving closer towards ultimate self-government even if, as in 1919, there was no clear timescale</li> <li>• There was increasing participation in the electoral process, which impacted on the relationship with Britain – from a very limited franchise for the wealthy in 1909 to a still restricted electorate of about 5 million in 1919 to a larger electorate of 60 million in 1935.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that British Government legislation, in the years 1909-35, did not result in a change in India's relationship with Britain should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Viceroy, and hence Britain, still maintained overall control of Indian affairs</li> <li>• Congress opposed both the 1919 and the 1935 legislation as not going far enough</li> <li>• Separate electorates enabled the British to continue to maintain a degree of divide and rule</li> <li>• Dissatisfaction with the legislation meant that Britain did not achieve its aim of undermining support for nationalism through limited concessions to the Indian middle classes.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' 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 that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about how accurate it is to say that, in the years 1920–39, Gandhi was crucial in advancing the cause of Indian independence.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1920–39, Gandhi was crucial in advancing the cause of Indian independence should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gandhi had an inspirational style of leadership that appealed to many different castes and religions in India. This enabled him to attract mass support for his satyagraha campaigns in 1920–22 and 1930, thus putting pressure on the British to make concessions</li> <li>• Gandhi developed a range of tactics that enabled ordinary people to participate in the campaign, for example tax boycotts, boycotts of British goods</li> <li>• Gandhi developed strategies that gave the moral high ground to the nationalists, for example the Dharasana Satyagraha</li> <li>• Gandhi's ability to negotiate with the British when necessary, for example the agreement with Viceroy Irwin in 1931.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1920–39, Gandhi was not crucial in advancing the cause of Indian independence should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of the campaigns directed by Gandhi ended in violence and had to be abandoned, for example 1920–22 campaign and events at the police station at Chauri Chaura</li> <li>• Some commentators argue that Gandhi's leadership style was confrontational and actually delayed progress towards at least dominion status</li> <li>• Events around the Round Table Conferences demonstrate that Gandhi did not speak for all Indians, despite his claims to do so</li> <li>• Gandhi's leadership style not only led to disagreements with the Muslim League but also divisions within Congress and thus delayed independence.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>