

Examiners' Report

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE
in History (WHI02) Paper 1A

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 2016

Publications Code UA041796

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:
<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Examiner Report WHI02/1A
Introduction

It was pleasing to see responses of a decent standard from candidates attempting the new AS Paper WHI02/ 1A: India, 1857-1948: The Raj to Partition. The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory two-part question for the option studied, each part based on one source. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts - cause, consequence, change/continuity, similarity/ difference and significance.

Generally speaking, candidates found Section A more challenging mainly because some of them were not clear on what was meant by 'value' and 'weight' in the context of source analysis and evaluation. The detailed knowledge base required in Section A to add contextual

material to support/ challenge points derived from the sources was also often absent. Having said this, although a few responses were quite brief, there was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer questions from Sections A and B. The ability range was diverse, but the design of the paper allowed all abilities to be catered for. Furthermore, in Section B, few candidates produced wholly descriptive essays which were devoid of analysis and, for the most part, responses were soundly structured. The most common weakness in Section B essays was a lack of knowledge. It is important to realise that Section A and Section B questions may be set from any part of any Key Topic, and, as a result, full coverage of the specification is enormously important.

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

Question 1

- (a) On Question 1(a), stronger responses demonstrated a clear understanding of the source material on the changes to the government of India introduced after the Indian Mutiny of 1857 and showed analysis by selecting some key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences (e.g. the Proclamation provided for freedom of religion). Knowledge of the historical context concerning the changes to the government of India introduced after the Indian Mutiny of 1857 was also confidently deployed in higher scoring answers to explain or support inferences, as well as to expand or confirm some matters of detail (e.g. for the first time, Indians would have a part in the government). In addition, evaluation of the source material was related to the specified enquiry and based on valid criteria to show the value of the source. Similarly, explanation of utility referred relevantly to the nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author (e.g. this is an official proclamation outlining the nature of the new government of India). Weaker responses demonstrated limited understanding of the source material on the changes to the government of India introduced after the Indian Mutiny of 1857, and attempted some analysis by selecting and summarising information and making basic/ undeveloped inferences relevant to the question. Lower scoring

answers also tended to add limited contextual knowledge to information taken from the source material to expand or confirm some points but these were not developed very far. Some candidates wrote at length on the Mutiny and made little or no use of the source material at all. This approach cannot score highly. Although related to the specified enquiry, evaluation of the source material by weaker candidates was limited and often drifted into 'lack of value' arguments. Furthermore, although the concept of utility was often addressed by noting some aspects of source provenance, it was frequently based on questionable assumptions.

1 (a) Why is Source 1 valuable to the historian for an enquiry into the changes to the government of India introduced after the Indian Mutiny of 1857?

Explain your answer using the source, the information given about it and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(10)

Source 1 is a proclamation by Queen Victoria to the ^{people of} Indians explaining the nature of Britain's relationship with India following the events of the Indian Mutiny / Rebellion of 1857. It ^{would} provide quite an accurate account of the changes to the government of India following the Rebellion, as it is an official statement but a number of factors undermine its usefulness and ~~spells out~~ in clear terms, the new rules.

Firstly, Source 1 is useful because it is issued in the name of Queen Victoria herself, who would become Empress of India afterwards. The proclamation talks of how the power of the East India Company would be transferred to the Raj, how a new Viceroy would be appointed to run the new government and the religious freedom and impartiality granted to their subjects. The proclamation was also drafted on the Queen's behalf by Viscount

Canning, the Governor General of India do in 1857, and not a third party unaffiliated with British matters in India so it is likely to be reliable.

However, Source 1 is simply an extract from the actual proclamation. Quite a few terms and statements, such as ones concerning India's trade and foreign affairs, may not be included. This undermines the trustworthiness of the source, as we are not seeing the whole picture. The provenance of the proclamation is also of significance. Viscount Canning, who was himself present during the events of the Mutiny and saw it in action, may have added a degree of bias to the terms - perhaps making them stricter or more repressive, because he knew the "nature" of Indians, or deliberately making the new British government seem more liberal and unthreatening than it is in order to further his / the government's agenda. This may be the case because, in the following years, the British Raj in India would exploit the Indians in a number of ways - that are most likely not men-



tioned in the proclamation.

In conclusion, the author of the proclamation in Source 1, combined with the lack of detail and the time lag between the time year of the ^{proclamation's} issue, ~~of the proclamation~~ it the government-issued statement ~~was~~ less reliable than expected, although the source does have a degree of information about the new British government in India following the uprising of 1857.



This is a level 2 response. There is a comprehension of the source material and some awareness of the nature of the source although this is not developed very far. On the second page, there is a lengthy passage covering Viscount Canning and the Mutiny which is not related to the source material and the focus on the question on changes to the government of India. Therefore this response cannot achieve level 3.

SECTION A

Answer ALL questions. Write your answers in the spaces provided.

Study Source 1 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

- 1 (a) Why is Source 1 valuable to the historian for an enquiry into the changes to the government of India introduced after the Indian Mutiny of 1857?

Explain your answer using the source, the information given about it and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(10)

The Indian Mutiny of 1857 was an uprising against the East India Company which was installed by the British in the 1850s. It was a trading company which represented Queen Victoria's and Britain's own interest in the raw materials India had to offer. Its installation was the first step in conquering a valuable geographical, logistical and military asset which was India. The Indian Mutiny was caused by unjust treatment of the Indian people who were influenced by the company. It was a perfect example of an oppressed people rising up against the face of ~~the~~ ~~British~~ ~~injustice~~. The British Parliament and Queen Victoria saw it necessary to 'politely' enforce themselves in a stricter manner to make it difficult for them to be uprooted in



India. These changes included installing Viscount Channing to be the first Viceroy and Governor-General of India, this was a key move in ensuring the newly-adjusted government of India would ~~have~~ ^{receive} proper supervision and direction in the way the British required.

Publishing specific laws and regulations that should be obeyed and adhered to was another key factor in securing their influence.

However, it could be said that this Proclamation of Queen Victoria to the Princes, Chiefs and People of India, 1 November 1858

(Source 2) had a firm but gentle attempting approach. This is supported by Britain's fore going her "right" to impose her religion on any of her subjects.

A statement was made claiming there would be no persecution or trouble shown against any person due to their religious faith. This was highly important as discrimination and condemnation of the Indian people by the East India Company was a strong factor in causing the 1857 uprising. This decree was passed in an attempt to please the people. However by no means

This particular source is valuable for the historian making enquiries into the changes made for the government of India concerning new British-Indian relations because it clearly imposes Britain as head of the territories of India that the East India Company originally occupied. It also gives a clear idea of where India stood here, i.e. ^{under} ~~below~~ British rule. This trading gold mine that Britain had drawn its attention to was slowly but surely sinking beneath British government. This proclamation was a step forward concerning how important India was to become to Britain's development in politics, economics and military standpoint. This source is valuable because it outlines the first steps taken to by Britain to conquer India. ~~The~~ The East India Company and this 1858 Proclamation that followed the Indian Mutiny of 1857 was the first step to crowning the British empire.

This is a level 3 response. The inferences are not developed by supporting with source material and contextual knowledge, but the comments on the purpose of the source are developed effectively and allow entry to L3.

(b) On Question 1(b) stronger responses demonstrated understanding of the source material on the reasons for the partition of India in 1947 and showed analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences (e.g. partition was necessary to prevent violence). Knowledge of the historical context concerning the reasons for the partition of India in 1947 was also confidently deployed in higher scoring answers to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge some matters of detail (e.g. the desire for partition in Muslim communities). In addition, evaluation of the source material was related to the specified enquiry and explanation of weight referred relevantly to the nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author (e.g. the possibility that Mountbatten is using the broadcast to pass the blame for partition to the Indian population). Judgements were also based on valid criteria such as Mountbatten's responsibility for organising the partition. Weaker responses demonstrated limited understanding of the source material on the reasons for the partition of India in 1947 and attempted some analysis by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question (e.g. the Indian population could not agree). Lower scoring answers also tended to add limited contextual knowledge to information taken from the source to expand or confirm points but this was not developed very far (e.g. the religious differences between Muslims and Hindus). Some candidates wrote at length on the topic of independence and Partition without relating their knowledge to the source. This approach cannot score highly. Although related to the specified enquiry, evaluation of the source material by weaker candidates was limited and often lacked focus on either the 'has weight' or 'doesn't have weight' aspect of the question. Furthermore, although the concept of utility was often addressed by noting some aspects of source provenance, it was frequently based on questionable assumptions (e.g. the source would hold no value because it came from Mountbatten).

(b) How much weight do you give to the evidence of Source 2 for an enquiry into the reasons for the partition of India in 1947?

Explain your answer using the source, the information given about it and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(15)

Source 2 gives a significant amount of weight to its evidence into the reasons for the partition of India in 1947. The source tells historians that Mountbatten (Viceroy in 1947) was out of options and that partition was the only ~~only~~ choice. The source also shows how he was powerless and gave up ~~and~~ on ~~try~~ trying to break the Congress - League dead lock. There also many other reasons that the source fails to mention & for example, the roles of Jinnah and Nehru.

Firstly, the source indicates that Mountbatten had run out of options and resorted to partition as his last hope. The source states that "the only alternative to using force is partition" to prevent "forcing any large areas in which one community has a majority to live against their will under a Government in which another community has a majority." Mountbatten wanted to, as far as possible, prevent any religious ~~problems~~ and violence that would result if Muslims were forced to live under Hindus or vice versa. A Boundary Commission was also called in in 1946 to

try and prevent these problems from brewing. Source 2 shows that Mountbatten had run out of options and states this clearly through his radio speech and is in line with other historical facts which suggest that ~~he was~~ partition was ~~only the option~~ the only option.

Secondly, the tone of the Source indicates that Mountbatten was powerless and unable to make Indian political leaders, being the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League, reconsider and change their minds about partition. The source states that it was Mountbatten's "first course to "urge the political leaders to accept unreservedly the Cabinet Mission Plan of May 6 1946" ... to my great regret it has been impossible to obtain agreement either on the Cabinet Mission or on any other plan that would preserve the unity of India." Mountbatten was unable to break the Congress-League deadlock that had been the result of the Simla conferences in 1945 and 1946 and he was also unable to convince leaders to accept the Cabinet Mission's proposals, one being full dominion status after the war. Both parties wanted partition and therefore, ~~it~~ did not change their minds. Source 2 shows this since the tone used is almost regretful and shows hints of Mountbatten having given up and being

powerless, showing that the source is valuable.

Thirdly, the provenance of the source also shows how valuable and reliable the source is. It is taken from Mountbatten's radio speech on 4 June 1947. This suggests that the source will have more insight into the actual views present in that time and ~~for~~ capture more of the distress and difficulty that Mountbatten and the British government faced before Partition, giving historians a reliable source for an enquiry into the reasons for the Partition of India in 1947.

However, the source may not be valuable due to potential bias. The source comes from Mountbatten, who at that time had a goal set for him by the British government - to get India off Britain's hands. The source only presents how it is almost the fault of the Indians' political parties that resulted in Partition. There were in fact, many other agendas involved in Partition, including the fact that India was becoming a great economic burden for Britain, who suffered major losses and increased spending in the

Second World War. Source 2 is not reliable because it fails to mention the ~~British~~ Indian views and Britain's reasons for partition, resulting in the source having potential bias.

~~Lastly~~ Lastly, the source failed to mention the roles of ~~Nehru~~ Jawaharlal Nehru and Mohammed Ali Jinnah in partition, which makes the source less significant. Nehru and Jinnah were one of the main ~~reasons~~ reasons for partition because they wanted it and saw it as the only option and drove their respective parties to ~~it~~ achieve this goal.

Nehru was heavily involved in partition, influencing the Mountbatten's lives and even resulted in certain towns, like Firzopur, being shifted to India before partition. The source doesn't mention these ~~two~~ two roles and also Mountbatten's dislike for Jinnah which may have caused him to give more benefits to India. The source becomes less valuable and is given less weight because of this fact.

P.T.O
→

Overall, source 2 is reliable since it gives an enquiry into some important reasons for partition such as the inability of Mountbatten to change the Indian political leaders minds and highlights how partition was the only hope for India. However, due to its failure to give both sides of the reasons for partition, the source loses some weight since these are important reasons such as India losing its value in Britain's eyes. The source is valuable, but only to a certain extent because of these reasons.

(Total for Question 1 = 25 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 25 MARKS

This is a level 4 response. The response effectively evaluates the source with relevant commentary on the claims being made, the tone of the source and the weight that can be attached to its provenance. Comments are underpinned by good contextual knowledge that is applied to the source material. The comments on what is missing from the source are a weaker part to the answer – candidates need to work with the material presented to them - but overall the response displays the qualities of a level 4 response.

Question 2

On Question 2, stronger responses targeted how accurate it is to say that, in the years 1857-1914, the Indian population did not benefit from British economic policies and included an analysis of the links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (consequence). Sufficient knowledge to develop the argument (removal of tariffs, commercialisation of agriculture, and development of railways) was demonstrated. Judgements made about whether the Indian population did not benefit from British economic policies were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of whether the Indian population did not benefit from British economic policies. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on consequence or were essentially a narrative of some events during the years 1857-1914. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was often evident, it tended to lack range/ depth (e.g. limited comments on famine). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

the welfare of the local Indians and hence illustrates that in the years 1857-1914, ~~the~~ most of the Indian population did not benefit from British economic policies.

Moreover, Lord Rippon's plan in 1883 which was a local self government plan gave the illusion that the Raj was ~~permitted~~ ^{permitting} freedom for Indians to take responsibility over their own ~~political~~ countries affairs, however the policy was merely set out to cut financial costs to the Raj for running local municipalities and local councils, and thus placed a financial cost on the natives of the subcontinent who had to ~~finance~~ a larger financial burden placed on them. Moreover, although jobs in the Raj were created for ~~native~~ Indians and employment rose for among the native population, greater taxes were placed on Indians and as taxes on expenditure were regressive, the Indian peasantry were plunged into financial turmoil - barely being able to purchase the necessities needed to sustain a decent quality of life, thus, highlighting that in the years 1857-1914, most of the Indian population did not benefit from British economic policies in India.

Furthermore, as Viceroy Lytton ~~reinstated~~ ^{took of} all the the taxes on British Lancashire cotton, at a time where the Indian cotton industry was ~~struggling~~ ^{struggling} due to famine, British cotton flooded the markets causing the Indian cotton industry to cripple, at a crucial time. Although

greater revenues were generated for the British Raj, the domestic economy suffered causing widespread unemployment in the Indian cotton market, hence establishing that during the years 1857-1914, most of the Indian population did not benefit from British economic policies.

However, although British ^{economic} policies ⁱⁿ ~~towards India~~ did not benefit most of the Indian population, some Indians ^{some British} in fact did benefit. However, policies laid out by George Nathaniel Curzon, who ~~served~~ ^{served as Viceroy} in India from 1898-1905 did benefit ^{the vast majority} of Indians. The development of the Indian railways in 1905 where 6000 miles of ~~track~~ ^{track} were laid out, greatly increased the ~~mobility of~~ ^{geographical mobility of} labour and broke ~~transportation~~ ^{transportation} barriers that India was faced with. Natives were able to take the trains and travel around the subcontinent for affordable rates, ~~which~~ and the railway system also greatly benefited trade between India and other countries. Furthermore, Curzon also took personal interest in restoring the Taj Mahal, ~~an~~ a building that was a dear representation of India's rich culture and hence brought a greater sense of patriotism amongst the Indians. Therefore, although most ^{economic} ~~British~~ policies ^{by the British} did not benefit most of the Indian population, the establishment of the railways in India was an exception as the locals as well as members of the Raj greatly benefited. ^{As a result,}

In addition, economic policies in India esta

benefited by the British benefited the Indian intelligentsia, the upper castes (Brahmins) and ~~the~~ Indian royalty. Princely states retained more revenue through British economic policy that helped pave the way for a trade boom, and hence areas such as ~~Kashmir~~ Kashmir, and Hyderabad & Gujarat prospered. Moreover, as the Raj needed ~~more~~ lawyers and other ~~upper~~ ^{the} members of upper class in order to sustain a smooth running of the subcontinent, the upper class of the social spectrum prospered, hence although most of the Indian population did not benefit from British economic policy in the years 1857-1914, the upper castes and classes of India did benefit.

Overall, although British policy in India economic policy in India was of benefit to a niche of the immense Indian population, to most Indians British economic policy placed greater economic and financial constraints due to higher domestic taxation, the abolition of tariffs on ~~the~~ Lancashire cotton and due to the Raj's funding of the man-power agreement with civil servants ^{working} ~~for the Raj~~, recruited by the Raj. Therefore, although India being classified as the "Jewel of the British throne", in reality majority of the Indians ^{were} ~~did~~ not involved with the rise in prosperity, hence during the years 1857-1914, most of the Indian population did not benefit from British economic policies in India.

This is a level 4 response. The key issues are fully explored and analysed. The knowledge is deployed effectively to address the conceptual focus of consequence and criteria are developed to reach the judgement. A particular strength is the consideration of the impact of British economic policies on different groups.

Question 3

On Question 3, stronger responses targeted how accurate it is to say that the First World War was the most significant factor in the growth of nationalism in India in the years 1900-1920. These included an analysis of the links between key issues and a focus on the concept (significance) in the question. In addition, sufficient knowledge was used to assess the significance of the First World War (e.g. INC's adoption of self-government as a goal after the war, impact of fighting in the war, the Montagu Declaration) set against a range of other factors (e.g. the Partition of Bengal, the 1919 Government of India Act, Amritsar). Judgements made about the relative significance of First World War were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of how accurate it is to say that the First World War was the most significant factor in the growth of nationalism in India in the years 1900-1920. Low scoring answers were also often lacked focus (didn't engage with significance) or were essentially a description of events in India during these years. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it lacked range/ depth (e.g. limited comments on the role of Gandhi). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

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

Chosen question number: Question 2 Question 3 Question 4

It is undoubtful that in the years 1900-1920, nationalism was ~~a~~ became very evident and spread throughout most of India. Many factors contributed to the rise and spread of the idea of nationalism and ~~self~~ some sort of self-rule, especially World War I because of India's continuous and full support and loyalty towards the British in their war effort. I also agree with because it was the first time the Indians really pressured Britain for change.

To begin with, World War I to many is considered to be the most significant factor to the growth of nationalism because the Indians believed that they should be rewarded for their support. India extensively helped Britain during their war effort through raw materials, clothing for the soldiers, manforce from India's army, and also aided them financially.

Also, Congress, the Muslim League and the princely states declared their loyalty to the British from the very beginning of the First World War. Therefore, politicians in India, as well as the masses, expected a reward back for ~~what~~ ~~they~~ what they provided Britain in their war effort in the form of increased control in governing in India, and increased autonomy. Hence, more and more people became nationalists and joined the nationalist movement (which later led to Indian independence).

However, there are also many other factors that contributed to the growth of nationalism in India. During 1900-1920, ~~polit~~ the Indians' political awareness was rising, therefore they believed that they were able to govern themselves, without any British intervention^{or support}. Firstly, the Home Rule Leagues were created in 1916, which were ~~very~~ radical and demanded independence from Britain. Through riots, rallies, campaigns and propoganda, these leagues managed to

gain a lot of support in only one year, hence ~~improving~~ proving their success in spreading the idea of nationalism to the public. Moreover, the creation of both the Muslim League and Congress, shows that the Indians were very politically active and aware. These groups became the main players in Indian politics and were the driving forces to change and independence. ~~The~~ Congress especially expanded in the beginning of the ~~1920s~~, 1920s and thus ~~more~~ became an initiator for ~~ref~~ change. Therefore, the increased political awareness with the rise of these groups and individuals, such as Gandhi, showed people that the Indians were able to govern themselves, and thus nationalism was growing.

~~Further~~ Perhaps the most important figure that spread the idea of nationalism was Gandhi. Gandhi was a very inspirational and educated figure who related himself to the masses; to different religions, castes and ~~economic~~ groups. He mainly spread

and advocated the ideas of civil disobedience (~~Satyagraha~~) (Satyagrahas) to achieve purna swaraj. We can see this when he introduced the first satyagraha in 1920, with the hopes of making the Raj ungovernable and hence the British would leave. Gandhi was also ~~of~~ the main reason for the expansion of Congress in the 1920s, because during his leadership, he succeeded in organising it and increasing its membership. The fact that Gandhi had such a large support base meant that more people ~~are~~ ~~are~~ ~~are~~ advocated for swaraj, leading to the rise in nationalism throughout India.

Furthermore, another factor that led to the introduction of nationalism in India prior to WWI was the partition of Bengal in 1906. Many argue that it was actually because of nationalism in Bengal that partition ~~place~~ ~~in the~~ ~~place~~ took place. Still, the partition angered many Indians and there was large discontent towards the British, especially ^{Viceroy} Curzon. This can be proven by the fact

That Bengal was reunited again in later years, as a result of the widespread anger ~~that it~~ and nationalism that it initiated.

In addition, the British ~~also~~ further played a part in the growth of nationalism through the reforms that they introduced and their unjust ~~actions~~ actions. The introduction of the India Councils Act through the ~~Lord~~ Morley-Minto reforms in 1909, and the Government of India Act in 1919, gave the Indians ~~more~~ ~~is~~ gradually more and more influence over their affairs and thus they became more politically involved, especially the minorities who were given reserved seats. This as a result increased the Indian's political awareness and their increasing power made ~~many~~ them believe that they were ready and willing to gain autonomy. Therefore, nationalism was growing as the British allowed the Indians to be more politically involved, which made them eager to ~~fight~~ demand dominion status and later independence.

angry at the way they were being treated. Thus, the Indians ~~supported~~ ~~of~~ resented the British and wanted ~~an~~ an end to their full control over their internal affairs, leading to the spread of nationalistic ideologies.

All in all, the period of 1900-1920 ~~is~~ ^{is} associated with the growth and spread of nationalism throughout India. Even though ~~many see~~ the First World War is seen as the most significant factor that led to this, other factors such as Indian political awareness and the British also played major roles in the increased support for more autonomy and the idea of nationalism.

Doc ID 0408001122301

This is a level 4 response. There is some analysis and attempt to explain the links between the key feature of the period and the question, although the candidate is not entirely successful in reaching a clear judgement for attributing the greatest significance. The knowledge used is sufficient to address the question and the answer is communicated well.

Question 4

On Question 4, stronger responses targeted the extent to which Gandhi's methods and campaigns resulted in progress towards Indian independence in the years 1920-39 and included an analysis of the links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (consequence). Sufficient knowledge to develop the argument (the use of non-violence, the Salt March, Gandhi's methods at the Round Table Conference, the 1935 Government of India Act) was demonstrated. Judgements made about the extent to which Gandhi's methods and campaigns resulted in progress were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of the extent to which Gandhi's methods and campaigns resulted in progress towards Indian independence. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on consequence or were essentially a narrative of some events during the years 1920-39. Some candidates mistook the focus as causation and considered Gandhi's methods as just one factor.

Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was often evident, it tended to lack range/ depth (e.g. limited comments Gandhi's beliefs). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

believed that they were fighting for the king and queen of England. This was how the First World War led to a rise in nationalism, by bringing soldiers home with a sense of wanting a free India, where they could choose whether or not to go into war.

On the other hand, Gandhi was another important factor in the growth of nationalism. Gandhi's satyagrahas, which meant life force, was his form of non-violent cooperation which allowed the Indians to protest without bloodshed. Gandhi abandoned Western-style clothing and began a daily routine of spinning by 1915. Peasants were able to identify with him since he dressed, behaved and lived like they did. Gandhi also focused on Muslims and businessmen, of whom were ignored by other parties. He believed that Western influences were ruining India and wanted the nation to step back to their roots and live as they did before, wearing dhotis and making their own clothes.

Gandhi's satyagrahas began in 1919 with a series of hartals in response to the Rowlatt

Acts. The ability of Gandhi to enact his satyagraha campaigns shows how nationalism did grow in India and how more and more Indians wanted to see an independent India, free of the Raj. Gandhi was also so successful that he became President of Congress in 1920. Gandhi ~~was able to~~ contributed greatly to the growth of nationalism as his ideas caught on with the Indian masses through his ~~at~~ satyagrahas, ~~and~~ non-violence non-cooperation movements and his idea of a united and independent India. This ~~was how~~ is why Gandhi is an important factor in the growth of nationalism between 1900-1920.

Another important factor is the growth of the Muslim population. Nationalism among Muslims grew as they formed their own party in 1906 - the All-India Muslim League. The presence of Jinnah also contributed to raising nationalism. Muslims were successful in achieving separate electoral status in 1909 with the Morley-Minto reforms, allowing them to stand for elections fairly and they were a ~~small~~ minority group. Nationalism among Muslims also grew with

Due to the Muslims being able to have a political voice, their sense of nationalism grew because they could influence decision-making in their country and how it was run, which is how Muslims were a factor in the growth of nationalism in India.

Another factor is the longing for an independent India and primarily for the Muslims, partition.

Bal Gangadhar Tilak was the 'founder' of nationalism in India as he spread ideas of democracy and independence which ~~was~~ caught on and were used by Congress and the League.

This drive of the Indian people along with the coordination of their respective parties, led to nationalism growing as people wanted to have their own country to govern by themselves and this desire only grew, which is how this factor led to the growth of nationalism between 1900-1920.

P.T.O.
→

In conclusion, Gandhi was a more significant factor in the growth of ~~nationalism~~ ^{nationalism} in India from between 1900-1920 since his ideas caught on fast with the masses, especially peasants as they were able to identify with Gandhi in the way he acted, dressed and lived. # Gandhi also lived in ashrams where the Hindu caste system was ignored and his idea of 'freeing the Untouchables' also caught on and raised nationalism for the Untouchable case. It can be argued that Gandhi's methods ignored the more middle-class Indians and princely states were not a favourable class to the Congress, questioning the extent to which Gandhi's methods were actually ~~self-fitting~~ self-fulfilling or meant to benefit society.

Overall, Gandhi's and his beliefs won the hearts and minds of many Indians and was a major ~~contributor to~~ factor ~~to~~ the growth of nationalism in India in the years 1900-1920.

This is a level 4 response. It explores relevant issues and assesses the impact of various factors that led to progression towards Indian independence. There are areas where the candidate has lapsed into a causal focus, but the response is always brought back to a consideration of impact. Hence this merits a level 4 mark.

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

Section A

Value of Source Question 1(a)

- Candidates must be more prepared to make valid inferences rather than to paraphrase the source
- Candidates should be prepared to back up inferences by adding additional contextual knowledge from beyond the source
- Candidates need to move beyond stereotypical approaches to the nature/ purpose and authorship of the source e.g. look at the specific stance and/ or purpose of the writer
- Candidates should avoid writing about the deficiencies of the source when assessing its value to the enquiry

Weight of Source Question 1(b)

- Candidates should be prepared to assess the weight of the source for an enquiry by being aware that the author is writing for a specific audience. Be aware of the values and concerns of that audience.
- Candidates should try to distinguish between fact and opinion by using their contextual knowledge of the period
- In coming to a judgement about the nature/ purpose of the source, candidates should take account of the weight that may be given to the author's evidence in the light of his or her stance and/ or purpose
- In assessing weight, it is perfectly permissible to assess reliability by considering what has been perhaps deliberately omitted from the source

Section B

Essay questions

- Candidates must provide more factual details as evidence. Weaker responses lacked depth and sometimes range
- Candidates should take a few minutes to plan their answer before beginning to write
- Candidates should pick out three or four key themes and then provide an analysis of (for e.g.) the target significance mentioned in the question, setting its importance against other themes rather than providing a description of each

- Candidates would benefit from paying careful attention to key phrases in the question when analysing and use them throughout the essay to prevent deviation from the central issues and concepts
- Candidates should try to explore links between issues to make the structure flow more logically and the arguments more integrated.

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