

# Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE in History  
(6HI01) Paper C

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information, please visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com).

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

[www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus)

### **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2016

Publications Code 43880

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
- 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.

## Unit 1: Generic Level Descriptors

Target: A01a and A01b (13%)

(30 marks)

Essay - to present historical explanations and reach a judgement.

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 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><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 5-6 marks</b> 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 the simple statements. Material is unlikely to be developed very far.</p> <p><b>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 11-12 marks</b> 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>

3	13-18	<p>Candidates' answers will attempt analysis and will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will, 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 accurate but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor.</p> <p><b>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 17-18 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 3.</p> <p>The writing will be coherent in places but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. Only some of the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are likely to be present. Syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
4	19-24	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. The selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p><b>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 23-24 marks</b> 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>

<b>5</b>	<b>25-30</b>	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response which directly addresses the focus of the question and which demonstrates explicit understanding of the key issues contained in it. It will be broadly balanced in its treatment of these key issues. The analysis will be supported by accurate, relevant and appropriately selected which demonstrates some range and depth.</p> <p><b>Low Level 5: 25-26 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 5: 27-28 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 5: 29-30 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 5.</p> <p>The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce convincing extended writing will be in place.</p>
----------	--------------	--

*NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*

#### **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.

#### **Unit 1 Assessment Grid**

Question Number	AO1a and b Marks	Total marks for question
Q (a) or (b)	30	30
Q (a) or (b)	30	30
<b>Total Marks</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>% Weighting</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>25%</b>

## C1 The Origins of the British Empire, c1680-1763

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1	<p>The question is focused on the reasons for the growth of British trading interests in the years c1680-1763 and requires an analysis, and evaluation, of the extent to which the primary cause was an increased consumption of products produced by slaves. Candidates may approach this question either by considering British trading interests in general or by reference to the fortunes of specific trading companies. However, it is likely that most responses will be an amalgamation of the two with candidates making direct reference to the work of the British East India Company, the Royal African Company and the South Sea Company to provide exemplification. In agreeing with the statement candidates might suggest that the consumption of slave produced goods such as sugar, coffee, tobacco and, later, cotton were the mainstay of British trade during this period; initially purely as luxury items but towards of the end of the period sugar, in particular, becoming part of the ordinary standard of living. As consumption grew so did competition within the Atlantic 'triangular trade' so that by 1713 the Royal African Company could no longer hold on to its monopoly.</p> <p>To establish the extent to which growth was primarily due to increased consumption candidates may refer to other causal factors such as the importance of the North Atlantic trading system, the role of government support, including the Navigation Acts, and the development of British trade to India. Responses might also refer to the role of war in providing new territorial outlets for trade and in the case of the War of the Spanish Succession, the <i>asiento</i> to the South Sea Company. It is possible that reference may also be made to the lure of lucrative investments in trading companies.</p> <p>At the higher Levels candidates may be able to show that there was a complex inter-relationship between many of the factors or point to geographical differences. For example, suggesting that increased consumption of plantation-based goods may have been responsible for growth in general but that it was only in the Atlantic trade that slaves provided labour.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will clearly address 'how far agree...primarily due to', by considering the strengths and limitations of the importance of the increased consumption of slave produce products in relation to other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p>At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the part played by the increased consumption of slave produced goods by addressing its strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by increased consumption and/or British</p>	30

	<p>trading interests. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	
--	--	--

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2	<p>The question is focused on the expansion of the British Empire in North America and the West Indies in the years c1680-1763, and requires an evaluation of the extent to which this can be explained as a consequence of European rivalry. At the highest Level it is expected that candidates will refer specifically to the two different geographical areas, and may even differentiate between areas within North America, but a balanced reference is not expected.</p> <p>In consideration of the role of European rivalry responses might refer to the direct territorial expansion gained as a result of European wars, such as the War of the Spanish Succession and the Seven Years' War, and the determination to consolidate imperial gains against France and Spain, in particular. Others might refer to European trading rivalries particularly in the lucrative West Indies. It possible that some responses might suggest that the pre-eminence of European rivalry as an explanation can be shown by the declaration of the Proclamation Line in North America after 1763.</p> <p>To establish extent candidates may refer to other causal factors such as economic factors connected to the slave trade and the needs of British industry or the social factors encouraging the growth of settler colonies in North America.</p> <p>At the higher Levels, responses will probably suggest a more complex interaction of forces while coming to a judgment about the role of European rivalry. For example, that European rivalry concerning trading interests and prestige led to wars which resulted in territorial expansion which subsequently provided resources required by Britain thus encouraging further expansion and consolidation.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will have a secure focus on the question, will weigh up the extent to which expansion was caused by the consequences of European rivalry, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement.</p> <p>At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Responses will begin to address the issue of European rivalry but with an imbalance towards strengths or to other factors.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. These responses may explain European rivalry and/or the expansion of the Empire with implicit reference to the question itself.</p> <p>At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

## C2 Relations with the American Colonies and the War of Independence, c1740-89

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3	<p>The question is focused on the political and economic relationship between Britain and its American colonies in the period before the War of Independence, and to evaluate the suggestion that it was only after 1763 that these tensions began to emerge.</p> <p>Most candidates are likely to disagree that it was only after 1763 that tensions began to emerge but will differ in their judgment of the extent of such tensions in the years before and after and may distinguish between economic and political tensions. 1763 was a pivotal year in the relationship between the American colonies and the ‘Mother Country’. The conclusion of the Seven Years’ War brought peace and the expectation on behalf of the colonists that there would be military withdrawal and return to the ‘salutary neglect’ of the period before 1756. However, relations between the colonies and Britain began to deteriorate as decisions were made not only to keep a military presence in the colonies but to expect the colonists to contribute towards it, to increase and extend taxation, restrict westward expansion and enforce legislation.</p> <p>Some responses might suggest that the ‘salutary neglect’ by Britain of the colonies before 1763 represented a period of harmonious relations with underlying tensions barely reaching the surface as the colonies ‘managed’ Governors and ignored mercantilist laws and so 1763 was an important turning point. Others might suggest that political tensions concerning state rights and the economic effects of smuggling in opposition to the Navigation Acts were more serious signs of tension and that events after 1763 only served to exacerbate a situation that was already breaking down.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the nature of the relationship before and after 1763, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement.</p> <p>At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus on the period after 1763.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4	<p>The question is focused on the contribution of foreign intervention as a key factor in the success of the American colonists. It requires an understanding of the extent to which the colonists could not have succeeded without this intervention. Candidates will probably determine the extent to which foreign intervention was vital by reference to the contribution of other factors. However, to reach the highest Level responses will need to compare directly the contribution of foreign intervention to other factors.</p> <p>Responses are likely to refer to French and Spanish intervention but may also mention the role of the League of Armed neutrality. In considering foreign intervention candidates might refer to the effect of the expansion of the war into a global conflict stretching British resources, the injection of French military skills and resources on the American side, the increased confidence of the Americans and the role of French naval supremacy in the defeat at Yorktown. However, it could be argued that the practical effect of foreign intervention has been over-emphasised, with reference to the lack of, and quality of the help provided, and that by 1778 the American army under Washington's leadership was in a strong enough position make a final challenge to the British.</p> <p>Other factors might be considered such as the incompetence of the British, the territorial advantages of the Americans and the logistical problems of fighting a long-distance war for the British.</p> <p>At the higher Levels candidates might suggest that, although foreign intervention was very important, particularly at Yorktown, American success was due more to the inter-linking of a variety of factors.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will have a secure focus on the question, will weigh up the extent to which the war could not have been won without the intervention of foreign powers, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement.</p> <p>At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

### C3 The Slave Trade, Slavery and the Anti-Slavery Campaigns, c1760-1833

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
5	<p>The question is focused on the cause of the rapid development of the slave trade at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, and requires an evaluation of the extent to which this can be explained by early British industrialisation. Towards the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century the trade in slaves across the Atlantic developed rapidly with British ports providing an increasing number of ships to transport more slaves. To reach the higher Levels candidates should focus their exemplification on this period of sustained expansion rather than making generalised statements about the development of the slave trade from the 1600s.</p> <p>Responses might suggest that the period of rapid development coincided with the beginnings of industrialisation in Britain and that demand from industry for the raw materials grown on slave plantations such as sugar, tobacco, cocoa and cotton increased the demand for slaves. This, in turn, led to the development of the triangular trade as a whole. The connection of British slave trading ports with such industries, for example, the Bristol sugar industry and Liverpool to the cotton industry may also be cited. To establish extent candidates may suggest other reasons for the increase in the slave trade including the need to transport more slaves to the Caribbean during and after the American revolution, rivalry with other European slaving countries, increased consumption of luxury items and the lack of humanitarian concerns for slaves working in the plantation system. Some candidates may suggest a complex inter-relationship between various factors. For example, that a triangular trade based on the supply of manufactured goods to West Africa, in return for slaves traded to the Americas to grow crops to be refined in Britain, developed more rapidly during the period because of the development of technology and industry in Britain so resulting in a greater demand for slaves.</p> <p>Responses that merely describe the triangular system are unlikely to achieve more than Level 2 or low Level 3 depending on relevance to the focus of the question.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will have a secure focus on the question, will weigh up the extent to which industrialisation was responsible for the rapid development, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement.</p> <p>At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
6	<p>The question is focused on the reasons behind the slow progress towards the abolition of slavery after the abolition of the slave trade in 1807. It requires an analysis, and evaluation of, the extent to which the most significant obstacle to achieving abolition was a lack of unity amongst the abolitionists. After the abolition of slavery it took another twenty-six years to achieve the abolition of slavery.</p> <p>In considering the lack of unity amongst abolitionists, candidates might refer to the decline in abolitionist activity in the 1810s. Some abolitionists, including to an extent Wilberforce, believed there was no need to abolish slavery because it would either wither away or that slavery itself could be made more humane. The Society for the Mitigation and Gradual Abolition was only set up in 1823. There were also divisions amongst those who supported the gradual abolition of slavery such as Fowell Buxton and those, often women, who pressed for immediate abolition.</p> <p>To establish relative significance responses may refer to other obstacles such as the continued strength of the West India lobby, the economic argument for slavery, fear of revolt and the lack of Parliamentary support in an era of political anti-reformism, war and social disturbance. Higher level responses might suggest a more complex interaction of factors. For example, that although a lack of unity amongst activists clearly slowed down the campaign against slavery, and that it was only after 1832 when the whole movement began to press for immediate abolition that the Act was passed, it still required a Parliamentary majority delivered by the Great Reform Act and the offer of compensation to the West India lobby to achieve success.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the significance of disunity amongst the abolitionists across the time period relative to other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement.</p> <p>At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus on the work of the abolitionists.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

**C4 Commerce and Conquest: India, c1760-c1835**

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
7	<p>The question is focused on the reaction of the traditional Indian rulers to the expansion of British power in India in the years c1760-1835. It requires an evaluation of the extent to which this reaction generally resulted in co-operation rather than resistance. Different rulers reacted in different ways to the expansion of British power. In the areas of initial East India Company infiltration there was often a combination of co-operation and resistance. In Bengal, the centre of East India Company operations, Indian rulers had both resisted and co-operated until by 1765 the Nawab had been replaced with a more co-operative rival and the Mughal had granted the <i>diwani</i> to Robert Clive. In the Carnatic region after years of co-operation the nawabs accepted formal annexation. In Mysore the rulers resisted control fighting three wars which ended with a final British attack in 1799 and the Marathas resisted Wellesley's advances. By 1820 40% of the sub-continent was controlled through subsidiary princely-states whose rulers had come to agreement with the British in return for some vestige of power with only Ranjit Singh in the Punjab in effective resistance. Candidates might suggest traditional rulers reacted to the expansion of British power in different ways at different times and although it may seem that many co-operated rather than resisted co-operation often came after resistance was proven to be futile.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will have a secure focus on the question, will give balanced consideration of the extent to which Indian rulers reacted with co-operation or resistance, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus, for example, on co-operation. <b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
8	<p>The question is focused on the cultural impact of British imperialism in India with reference to the work of Christian missionaries after being granted official permission to evangelise from 1813. It requires an evaluation of the suggestion that Christian missionaries made no significant impact in India. Answers may refer to the growing missionary activity in India, particularly in the south during the 1820s and 1830s, the attempts to introduce education, missionary influence in the campaigns against thuggee and suttee, and challenges to injustice from Company rule. Responses may agree that Christian missionaries made little impact by reference to the lack of success in influencing conversion, early hostility to missionaries from Company officials, Company reluctance to support the extension of education, and resistance from indigenous communities.</p> <p>However, it might be suggested in the later period there was some advancement which had a limited but significant impact on the attitudes of the ruling class towards the indigenous Indian population. Later support for Christian activity in the 1830s included the arrival of more sympathetic Company officials who discarded the orientalist viewpoint of the early administrators and the growing belief in the role of education in the creation of an indigenous Indian progressive class. Some responses might suggest that while having little impact on changing religious beliefs missionary activity had implications for future administrative and social policy.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the extent of Christian missionary impact, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement.</p> <p>At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

**C5 Commerce and Imperial Expansion, c1815-70**

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
9	<p>The question is focused on the contribution of a key factor to the expansion of British imperial influence after the end of the Napoleonic Wars. It requires an evaluation of the contribution made to expansion by later British industrialisation. Answers may consider importance with reference to the importance of manufactured goods to industrialisation and how the supply of cheap raw materials was vital to maintain competitiveness, to the role of British merchants in supplying raw materials and providing markets for manufactured goods and to the export of British technical expertise including railway technology. Candidates may refer to specific suppliers and markets within the Empire such as those for cotton and tea. Reference might also be made to both formal acquisitions and the establishment of ‘informal’ influence in pursuance of both raw materials and markets. The contribution of industrialisation to the development of military technology and capability might also be considered. To establish relative importance candidates will probably refer to other factors such as strategic requirements, international prestige, the role of the Navy and the Pax Britannica.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will have a secure focus on the question, will weigh up the extent to which the industrialisation contributed to the expansion of imperial influence, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement.</p> <p>At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
10	<p>The question is focused on the methods used to expand British imperial influence in the years after the Napoleonic Wars. It requires an analysis, and evaluation of, the relative contribution of the use of force in the process of expansion. In considering the use of force, candidates might suggest that the territorial acquisitions of war in 1815, such as the Cape and Malta, allowed the British to use naval force to expand British influence through the concept of ‘gunboat diplomacy’. In areas of ‘informal’ influence, such as China, West Africa and the Far East, Britain was able to use the navy to enforce alliances and treaties and to establish trading relations. To establish the extent to which expansion was mainly achieved through force candidates might compare the given factor with other factors or consider changing influences over time. Some responses might suggest that force was rarely used during this period of relatively weak imperial rivals, although the threat of force was often very effective, and that other more significant forces such as trading companies, British industrial development or missionaries may explain expansion. Others might focus on the threat of force itself citing events in China 1839/42, the Sikh Wars 1856/60, Afghanistan, and perhaps even the Falkland Islands.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will have a secure focus on the question, will weigh up the extent to which force was used, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement.</p> <p>At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

**C6 Britain and the Scramble for Africa, c1875-1914**

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
11	<p>The question is focused on the expansion of British influence along the Nile Valley and in east Africa in the years before 1914 and requires an evaluation of the extent to which this can be explained by the consequences of international rivalry. At the highest Level candidates will differentiate specifically between the two geographical areas but balance is not expected.</p> <p>In consideration of the case for international rivalry candidates may refer to the specific rivalry between France and Britain in Egypt and along the Nile Valley and between Germany and Britain in East Africa. British exploitation of Egyptian financial difficulties, the response to the Mahdi in the Sudan, the Fashoda Incident and the trade rivalries between McKinnon and Karl Peters might be used in exemplification. Reference might also be made to the influence of the Berlin West Africa Conference 1884-5 and the perceived threat of Russian expansion into the Ottoman Empire.</p> <p>To establish extent candidates will probably refer to other factors such as strategic concerns, Britain’s civilising mission in Africa, men-on-the-spot and economic investment. Responses may also refer to the counter-arguments of metropolitan and peripheral theories but these should be deployed with exemplification and not just stated if they are to be rewarded in the higher Levels.</p> <p>Higher Level responses may suggest that expansion is better explained through the interaction of various factors. For example, that the British looked to expand in the Nile region to protect the strategic sea route to India from potential Russian threat, to protect the Nile valley from both French and German incursion while exploiting the resources of the valley through economic investment.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will have a secure focus on the question, will weigh up the extent to which expansion of influence was caused by international rivalry, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. Both geographical areas will be addressed.</p> <p>At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
12	<p>The question is focused on the extent of popular support for imperial expansion in Africa between the buying of shares in the Suez Canal and World War 1. It requires an analysis of the suggestion that popular support increased steadily across the period.</p> <p>It is difficult to gauge exactly popular support for Empire across the period but public interest in Empire increased during the period. After the 1867 Reform Act politicians began to use imperial policy as an issue with which to attract the growing electorate. Politicians throughout the period, including Disraeli and Chamberlain, believed that pro-Empire policies would attract newly enfranchised voters. As Britain expanded its Empire popular culture reflected and interpreted events in Africa and by the 1880s it could be argued that ‘jingoism’ had become established in magazines, books, newspapers and the music halls. Specific events also influenced the popular imagination such as the defence of Rorke’s drift and the death of Gordon. The highpoint of popular support for the African Empire probably came with the relief of Mafeking in the Boer War and the result of the Khaki Election. After this point in the Boer War challenges to imperialism, which had always been present within the public, came to the fore with revelations about the scorched earth policy of Kitchener and the concentration camps. This did not lead to the complete disillusion in Empire which some responses will probably suggest but did cause questions to be asked.</p> <p>Candidates might agree that public support increased steadily throughout the period until the Boer War while others might suggest that popular support surged in the 1880s. Some responses may refer to continued scepticism across the period or reflect that there were peaks and troughs of enthusiasm in response to specific events.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the extent to which popular support steadily increased across the period, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement.</p> <p>At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

**C7 Retreat from Empire: Decolonisation in Africa, c1957-81**

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
13	<p>The question is focused on Britain’s rapid retreat from its African possessions in the years after 1957 and requires an analysis, and evaluation of, the extent to which this was result of international circumstances at the time. The independence of Ghana in 1957 had been a planned withdrawal from Empire and Britain was implementing a policy of slow withdrawal. However, from 1957 to 1965 the majority of Britain’s African colonies were decolonised more rapidly than had been planned.</p> <p>In consideration of international influences candidates might refer to the attitudes of the USA, USSR and UN to Empire, in particular their response to the Suez Crisis of 1957, Britain’s desire to join the Common Market, the global implications of nuclear weapons and the French and Belgian withdrawal from Africa.</p> <p>To establish extent responses will probably refer to the relative influence of other factors such as economic considerations, domestic problems in Britain, changing British public opinion or the rise of African nationalism.</p> <p>Responses at the highest Level might suggest that rapid retreat was due to the interaction of a variety of factors. For example, that the international response to the Suez Crisis exacerbated financial problems in Britain and the new Prime Minister Macmillan having established that the African colonies were no longer economically viable determined that the British public would be willing to accept that the ‘winds of change’ in Africa needed to be addressed.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will have a secure focus on the question, will weigh up the extent to which rapid retreat was caused by the international situation at the time, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement.</p> <p>At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
14	<p>The question is focused on the nature of British withdrawal from Africa and the extent to which independence led to black majority rule. It requires an explanation of why black majority rule was achieved in some countries but not others, specifically Southern Rhodesia and South Africa. Candidates should address both the reasons why Southern Rhodesia and South Africa had not achieved black majority rule and the other territories had. Some responses may suggest direct links between the two; most of the other territories had no significant settler populations which meant that there was little opposition from white colonists. Also in most of the other territories the initial hand-over of power had been to united nationalist parties such as in Ghana, Kenya and Tanzania and/or to respected traditional leaders such as Seretse Khama in Botswana. Also most of these territories in the 1960s had little obvious natural wealth to be exploited on a large scale.</p> <p>However, in parts of southern Africa the situation was different. South Africa and Southern Rhodesia both had significant white minorities, divisions within the African nationalist movement, and practised segregation. Both countries also had mineral wealth to be exploited notably gold and diamonds in South Africa and minerals and coal in Southern Rhodesia. In Southern Rhodesia the white minority government had refused to accept the ‘winds of change’ and had declared UDI in November 1965. The African nationalists were split into two major divisions and would fracture further later on. By 1969 a South African-backed Rhodesian government was at war with both ZAPU and ZANU who were in turn being supported by external Communist countries. In the special case of South Africa the situation was even more complex. South Africa had become a self-governing Union, and after the victory of the Afrikaner Nationalist Party in 1948 was run by a segregationist white minority which declared itself an independent republic in 1961. There was little the British could do to affect the situation after 1961. The apartheid policies of divide-and-rule meant that the black majority population were unable to mobilise against the regime effectively in the 1960s and divisions amongst nationalists made the situation even more difficult. In both cases the British failed to respond and there was still white minority rule in 1969.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the relative significance of reasons why some countries but not others achieved majority rule, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement.</p> <p>At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance.</p> <p>At <b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate</p>	30

	material in places. <b>Level 1</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question.	
--	---	--