



Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

January 2018

**Pearson Edexcel International Advanced
Level in History (WHI02)**

**Paper 1A: India, 1857-1948: The Raj to
Partition**

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

Introduction

It was pleasing to see a range of well-informed and well-written responses from candidates on IAS Paper WHI02 1A which covers the option 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.

It is pleasing to note that in Section A more candidates understood what was meant by 'value' and 'weight' in the context of source analysis and evaluation this series. Most candidates did possess a knowledge base on which they could draw to support/challenge points derived from the sources. Some candidates are still writing about limitations in question 1a and this did impact on the length of question 1b for some candidates.

In Section B, while some candidates produced wholly descriptive essays which were devoid of analysis, more responses were soundly structured. The most common weakness in Section B essays was the lack of a sharp focus on the precise terms of the question and/or the second order concept that was targeted.

It remains important to realise that Section A topics are drawn from highlighted topics on the specification whereas 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. There was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer questions from Sections A and B.

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

Question 1a

There were some good responses that achieved high Level 2 or beyond. These responses demonstrated an understanding of the source material and an ability to draw and develop inferences from the material using their contextual knowledge to explain inferences as well as expanding on matters in the source. Valid comments were made on the provenance of the source and value explained. Most candidates who failed to reach Level 3, did so because of questionable assumptions regarding the provenance and a mistaken tendency to discuss the limitations of those and using contextual knowledge incorrectly to evaluate the limitations. There were also a number of responses with very limited contextual knowledge on the Royal Titles Act and which provided lengthy descriptions of the role of the East India Company before the Raj and the 1857 Mutiny without focus on the task set.

It must first and foremost be understood that ~~any his~~ all historical documents and documentations are prone to bias, this transcript proves to be no exception. The speech given in the text is designed to be persuasive and not give an objective and unbiased view. This can be inferred from the context of it: ~~that it is desig~~ Prime Minister Disraeli addressing the House of Commons before they vote on ~~a~~ ~~bill~~ the Royal Titles Bill 1876. That's not to say that this speech provides no insight into the historic nature of the relationship between Britain and India.

First, the British House of Com it could be reasoned using this source alone that ~~at~~ at least around the time of the speech (March 1876) the H of Commons desired to rule

India with benevolence, ~~as opposed~~
This is supported by the fact that Disraeli repeatedly makes the point that India ~~desires~~ wants this Bill to be passed. "It is desired in India. They know what this Bill means, and they know it is what they wish." ~~A~~ ~~the~~ A discerning historian could also understand that India "knowing what it means" means that there was transparency between the British government and the Indian body of governance.

A historian could also reasonably know using this source that the Indian people at the time ~~it~~ did not feel that the Britain ~~was~~ had extended its hand in co-operation and had not acted with benevolence ~~at~~ at least not in the past. This is supported by Disraeli ~~stating~~ imploring the House of Commons to "let the people of India feel that there 'is a spirit of co-operation between us and them.'" He then goes on to say that this Bill would ~~it~~ add security to

"Her" ~~empire~~ (Queen ~~the~~ Victoria) empire,
meaning to ~~make~~ add security to the British
empire.

~~If~~ ~~secure~~ If security need be made more
secure ~~if this relat security is so lacking~~ that
it is brought to the attention of the Prime Minister
as well as the House of Commons then the security
is so sufficiently lacking it the empire could be
reasonably called insecure. Since this bill centres
revolves around Britain's relationship with bettering
Britain's relationship with India ~~then~~ and if
it passes then Britain's empire would be
made more secure as well as be more co-operative
with India then it can be said that ~~the~~
~~the Bill India is an i.~~ was an imperial
subject of Britain. Because the Bill ~~was~~
~~designed to ti to~~ was designed to bring a
spirit of co-operation then it can be said
~~From~~ known from this source the ~~the~~ Bill
would pass ~~compromises~~ a series of
compromises Britain has made in the
Bill in order to secure their foothold and
relationship with India.

This is a good level 3 response achieving level 3 on bullet points 1 and 3 in the mark scheme. It has good inferences and makes valid points about the provenance of the source to establish its value. It is weaker in using contextual knowledge to interrogate the source to establish its value.

Question 1b)

The best responses were written by candidates who successfully made reasoned inferences, evaluating the weight of the source in relation to the enquiry and using contextual knowledge to illuminate limitations of what could be gained. Most candidates who did not achieve Level 4 failed to do so due to making inferences that were not fully developed or reasoned. Candidates often used accurate contextual knowledge but this was usually only included to confirm/challenge details rather than going the step further to illuminate what could therefore be gained from the source. Some candidates with an in-depth knowledge of the famine lost focus on the task of source evaluation and wrote at length about the famine without regard to the source and this limited their achievement in the levels. Candidates do need to remember that stand alone knowledge is not rewarded in A02 and that knowledge is used with the source material to reach judgements about the weight that can be attached to the source.

The source puts most of the blame for the famine in India in 1943 on the ~~poor~~ original poor ~~in~~ levels of food availability and the selfish acts of individual ~~states~~ ^{provinces} after 1941. This is understandable as it is coming from a British civil administrator in India; they would not put blame on themselves, or the greater British Empire.

Source 2 describes the condition ~~at~~ before the famine as "a ^{little} ~~just~~ above the starvation line" and "below ~~the~~ starvation line by western standards. Just from this, it can be inferred that although ~~two~~ two-thirds of the population in India have been ~~starving in~~ technically starving by western standards, not much have been done to deal with it, such as converting farms that have been forcibly converted to cash crop farms back to food crop farms, which could have easily helped the problem at its core.

Moreover, although it has been mentioned that there was a ~~small~~ "slight disturbances of the economic practices of the country, and a small reduction of the overall available supply," there ~~is~~ are no further description of the extent of the disturbances and reduction, nor the causes for those external factors. This decreases the weight of this source when studying the reasons for the famine 1943.

Lines "so delicate was the balance between actual starvation and bare subsistence" and "had consequences out of proportion"

~~one by~~ can barely qualify as reasons for the famine. Instead, it looks to be more of an excuse as to why a famine was an inevitability, not something that has been caused, mostly by the British and their war efforts.

As previously stated, the source puts another part of the blame partly on the ^{British} government and partly on the provincial governments. It is stated that before going to war with Japan in 1941, the Government of India gave the provinces power to prohibit the movement of food and the right to requisition it. This in turn became a fight for the lacking food and resources, eventually leading to a scarcity of food in the country and the inflation that followed. ~~This~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~ ~~Regarding this~~, Much weight can be given to this explanation of the famine. As it is a government report, the fact that provinces were given power to control the flow of food in 1941 ~~caused~~ caused the famine in 1943 is plausible considering the lack of food in the first place, and that as provinces attempted to collect and hoard food for themselves, the price would have undoubtedly increased as well. Moreover, considering that two-thirds of the population was near poverty, even a slight increase in food prices could leave many unable to purchase food as the source

true to some extent. However, evident from the previous commissions, such as the Simons Commission, it cannot be expected to give much information that would put the Empire in a negative view. Reinstating, source 2 gives much ~~insight~~ insight into ~~more~~ more basic causes of the famine, such as the ~~general lack of food~~ already precarious balance between ~~the~~ starvation and bare subsistence minimum rates of food, and the struggle of each provinces for ~~food~~ food and resources, which left the masses in poverty unable to purchase food for themselves due to the inflation caused by the struggle. However, the source cannot be used as the only ~~source~~ source explaining the reasons for the famine, as it lacks the details regarding what caused the reduction in overall available ~~supply~~ supply of food and the disturbances of the economy ~~which is not likely~~. This was most likely due to war efforts, allocating food and resources ~~to~~ to the army, which would have put Britain in a bad position. Moreover, it is unfortunate that more fundamental reasons such as over plantation of cash crops and lack of food crops and the British refusal to develop the secondary industry, industrialization, in India which could have brought many more Indians with more income, allowing them to ~~buy~~ buy ~~with more money~~ ^{more} to purchase food.

has stated.

Some weight can be given to ~~the~~ Source 2 for an enquiry into the reasons for famine in India in 1943. ~~Source 2~~ Source 2 is an ~~official~~ ^{government} report, made ~~by the~~ it can be trusted to be

This is a level 4 entry response. It attempts to interrogate the evidence and does distinguish clearly between claims and information. It includes reasoned inferences and considers both the strengths and limitations of the source. It has a judgement that arises out of the main body of the answer.

Question 2

This was a popular question which produced a number of well-focused responses. Those candidates who did answer the question showed some awareness of the second order concept – change and continuity – and were able to draw out ways in which progress self-government was limited as well as ways in which real progress was made. These included the continued authority of the Viceroy, the Morely-Minto Reforms and the Rowlatt Acts of 1919. The most common problem which limited achievement in this answer was candidates who wrote extensively about events that were out of the period or who described events without linking them to the focus of the question.

The years 1898-1909 provided an abundance of change and continuity within India, as the beginning of the 1900s experienced strict rule from Curzon, it can be said that prospects for self government were becoming more possible, however upon further analysis one can see how there were limitations to the advancement towards swaraj.

The partition of Bengal in 1905 was seen to have had catalytic effects due to Curzon's need to administer the unruly province of Bengal. This demonstrates how key individuals such as Curzon, the viceroy, was very out of touch with who he was ruling as the partition fuelled unrest from congress, who refused to accept that the Muslims gained a majority in one of the divided parts. ^{Thus,} one can see that the partition facilitated how Curzon was ~~unwilling to~~ ready to impose his own ideologies into the administration of India, and diluted prospects

Gorzon, Minto was willing to appease the Indians. Additionally, the meeting between Gorzon and Minto established how concessions had to be made, which led to the Morley Minto reforms of 1908, facilitated in the Government of India Act of 1909. These reforms furthered prospects of self government as they allowed 60 Indians on the viceroy's executive council, 27 of whom would be elected by special interest groups and communities. ~~And~~ This allowed more Indian say in the government which ended 100 years of all white colonial rule. ~~However~~ However, one can see that the aim of self government ^{wasn't} ~~didn't~~ fully manifested until the Montagu-Chelmsford report of 1918, entrenched in the Government of India Act of 1919, where ~~the~~ ~~it~~ ~~was~~ Dyarchy, the division of rule was established. Within Dyarchy, Britain would remain in control of →

Especially since Morley appointed 2 Indians to his advisory council in India, and Minto appointed Governor of Bengal to be a law member, even though Morley viewed this as defensive action

communications, defence, foreign affairs and currency whereas Indian provincial governments would now have control over agriculture, education, health, ~~and other~~ etc. On the

Viceroy's advisory council, It was said during the 1919 Act that 3 of the 6 had to be Indians, showing how Indians gained power and a say. However, these three Indians had to be appointed, and the viceroy was allowed to ~~impose~~ enforce laws even with their opposition. Thus, it can be said that ~~the~~ ~~is~~ possibility for self government was diluted due to the lack of ability of a real voice with true administrative powers.

It is accurate to say that the years 1898-1919 were limited in ~~a~~ progress towards self government as one can argue that the war of 1914 was met with instant loyalty, even from extremist Bal Gangadhar Tilak, as it was a Mughal custom to fight and be brave. ~~Howe~~ On the other hand, Indians were fighting for other countries democracy when they themselves were refused it. Hence, One can say

of Indian say in the partition. ^{Additionally,} ~~However,~~ ~~the~~
one can see that the takeover of Tibet, conducted
by Curzon ~~in 1903~~ ~~and~~ gave British
imperialism a very bad image, which facilitated
the view ^{to the Indians} that Britain would not loosen their
~~decision, making~~ ~~to~~ grip on their controlling
nature, making hopes for self government minimal.
Although ~~the~~ the Montagu declaration of 1917
expressed the aim to allow India self
government, there was no timescale present which
demonstrated how although this reform had
promised ~~the~~ the aim of self government, the
British lacked the ability to provide ~~any~~ certain
information to the ~~the~~ Indians, and only gave
them hope.

~~The~~ However, one can see how the British
were being conciliatory towards the Indians
as ~~in the~~ prior to the Morley Minto
reforms of 1909, the governor of Punjab feared
that the army was planning an uprising, ~~as~~
as well as how many ~~for~~ were upset over
changes and regulations over ~~a~~ new irrigation
systems set up by the Raj. Thus, Minto removed
these changes which bolstered the Punjab's
army's loyalty, showing how unlike

that the 1919 Rowlatt acts where Rowlatt, a British lawyer set apart Punjab, Madras and Bombay as provinces with revolutionary activity and introduced Rowlatt Acts which entailed trial without a jury, censorship, house arrest and imprisonment without trial, displaying how ~~pro~~ the British were not going to relax their grip on India and that self government was ~~not~~ limited.

~~Despite lack of British~~

One can see that other nationalists such as Ranade, Ghiplunkar and Tilak lay the foundation for future nationalism, and how

Therefore, one can see how ~~it~~ it is in fact accurate to say that progress for self government was limited as despite the reforms and acts, no true power was given to the Indians without some form of a restriction, and one can say that these years provided the basis for future prospects of self government

This is a secure level 4 response. It maintains a clear focus on the question throughout. The knowledge is sufficient although there are occasions where there is a lack of clarity. The judgement is based on valid criteria.

Question 3

This was a popular question which drew a range of answers. At the highest level, candidates wrote well-informed responses which explored the given factor, repression, and contrasted this method of ruling with other factors including inquiries and consultations, conciliation and acts of Parliament. Candidates who did not achieve the higher levels often produced very descriptive answers with a focus on the Amritsar Massacre and little else. It is important that candidates cover the time period set in the question. Candidates would benefit by taking a few minutes to plan their answer to address the question set before writing.

The British did use repression to maintain its rule on India in ¹⁹¹⁹⁻²⁹ instances ~~was~~ such the Amritsar Massacre in 1919 and the Civil Disobedience Movement in 1930. However, there were instances where the Raj ~~try~~ ^{tried} to maintain their rule through negotiations, ~~and~~ ^{acts and discussion} ~~and~~ ^{or simply doing nothing} stalemates. These include the Indian Council Act of 1919, ^{failure of the} Non-Cooperation - Non-Violent ~~Movement~~ ^{Movement} in 1922 through the Round ~~for~~ Table Conferences, ^{the Gandhi-Irwin Pact in 1931} the Communal Award of 1932, and the 1935 Federation Act.

Prior to the Amritsar Massacre, Martial Law to maintain control was introduced to control protesting - a key method of repression. This in turn caused more rioting which led to the ~~Amritsar~~ ^{Amritsar} Massacre. ^{The worst form} Further repression of repression ^{in British rule} was used ie guns. Throughout British rule, the repression used on the Amritsar Massacre ~~was~~ ^{was} the worst and such and act was never repeated.

^{as the years progressed,} Instead, the Raj resorted to jailing ~~its~~ to try to maintain rule. Such a statement can be justified by the 1930 Civil Disobedience Movement where ^{60,000} participants were ~~jailed~~ jailed.

However, there were instances ~~where~~ ^{times} when repression

was not used to maintain order - through acts, negotiations

Acts such as the Indian Council Act of 1919 where Dyarchy was established. A dual government was meant to be created, ^{between} ~~among~~ the British and Indians. Indians and the British Raj would ^{exercise} ~~exercise~~ power sharing. Another key act would be Indian Act of 1935 where ~~Dyarchy~~ Dyarchy was abolished and India became a federation. Such acts ^{could} ~~can~~ be regarded as ways to ^{appeal} ~~appeal~~ Indians ^{but to} make their position as a ruling power more firm.

There were also negotiations between the Raj and Indians. ~~The Round Table Conferences~~ ^{The Round Table Conferences} ~~At the First Round~~ were a series of failed attempts to try offer more control into the hands of Indians ~~ie ex~~. The First Round Table Conference was ~~for the~~ to consult Indians on the proposal of Dominion status in the ~~At the~~ Nehru Report. However, it was a failure ~~as~~ due to the lack of participation from Indians. The Second and Third Conferences followed the same pattern of collapsing.

Lastly, ~~The~~ British maintained control through its state ~~interests~~ ^{is} ~~is~~ the Gandhi-Irwin Pact. Viceroy at the time was at a dilemma ~~as~~ during the time of the ~~the~~ Civil Disobedience Movement in 1930, ~~to~~ whether ~~or not~~ to introduce Martial Law to maintain order. However, the British Raj refrained from using such methods of

repression, recalling the Manacra just 10 year earlier. Therefore, the political statements took its form in the Gandhi-Irwin Pact. Gandhi agreed to end the satyagraha movement and attend the second Round Table Conference. In exchange, Irwin removed ~~to the salt tax~~ released those ~~temporarily~~ imprisoned during the campaign and return confiscated possessions to its owners.

~~The most important argument to the question~~
Most importantly of all, ^{was} ~~the~~ British has to be The Non-Violent - Non Cooperation Movement of 1919. The movement ended with the violence of the ^{Indian} participants themselves. ~~and~~ The British Raj refrained from ~~the~~ using any methods of repression against Gandhi's Campaign and the people caused the problems by becoming aggressive, ~~defiant~~ defiant and ~~the~~ threatening in Gandhi words.

The most important argument to the question has to be the fact that the British used ^{the} ~~to~~ tactic of disension ^{the Raj} to maintain order. As long as India remained divided ^{in it} could prolong their rule (but only for so long, ~~they~~ ^{they} examples would be ~~separate~~ the Communal Award in 1933. It was ^{the} ~~an~~ award, ^{of separate electorates} given to political parties ie Untouchables, Sikhs and princely states for their participation in the Round Table Conference. Gandhi fasted unto death for its ~~withdrawing~~ withdrawal knowing it would divide India.

In conclusion, to a certain extent, repression was used

to maintain ~~the~~ British's Britain's rule in India ^{but in} ~~in~~ very few instances. Most of the time, ^{however,} the British resorted to appealing ^{Indians} ~~and~~ using non-violent tactics to keep their rule more secure i.e disension.

This is a low level 4 response. The introduction shows a clear focus on the question and this is developed during the answer. The time frame is covered well. The supporting knowledge is sufficient to address the questions and key issues are explored. There are

occasional weaknesses in the analysis but valid criteria for judgment are established and supported.

Question 4

This was by far the most popular question. The best responses developed a very clear comparison of Gandhi's and Jinnah's approaches to achieving Indian independence across the time period and drew out the similarities and differences including the shared aim of removing the British from India and their similar use of negotiations as well as differences driven by their different religions as well as Gandhi's direct action campaigns compared to Jinnah's disapproval of such methods and preference for direct negotiation with the British on behalf of the Muslim population. Lower scoring responses tended to deal extensively with Gandhi and offer a limited perspective on Jinnah. Some candidates wrote about each man separately and missed the opportunity to develop a comparison and this limited their analysis and achievement.

Grandhi and Jinnah were both seen as prominent leaders of their respective political parties that created an impact through their campaigns to achieve Indian Independence. Both of these leaders had different visions for India. They were divided by religion. Grandhi being a Hindu (majority) part of the Indian National Congress that made it's progress towards self-governance in the beginning of 1920s decided to fight for full Independence instead. Jinnah who was a Muslim (minority) was the leader of the Muslim League. He proposed the idea of Pakistan. Although Grandhi and Jinnah were divided by dreams there were some similarities in their approach.

Throughout most of their campaigns both leaders adopted the idea of non-violence although it failed many times. However, they had different views when it came to cooperation. Grandhi firmly believed in non-cooperation with the British. He expected to make India ungovernable by the British Raj by going against them in a peaceful way. He exemplified this by creating the salt Satyagraha against the British salt tax which was highly successful. Jinnah believed in cooperating with the British to get what he wanted, which was the separate state for Muslims. Jinnah made negotiations with the British for separate electorates for Muslims. Although, their approach was different they both disagreed with the British during World War II where the British were willing to grant Independence after war with the formation of a new constitution. Both leaders were against this idea.

In the beginning of 1920s, the Muslim League and the Indian National Congress came together to form the Lucknow Pact where they decided to pressure the government

for self-governance. This was an attempt to unify the divided religious groups to pursue a common goal. This shows that both were willing to work with one another. However, their common goal got divided as Gandhi aimed for a unified independent India with a Hindu Majority while Jinnah aimed for a separate state with Muslims as a majority. This shows that although different, both leaders kept the interests of their religious groups at a higher importance. Gandhi wanted all minority groups to be unified however, emphasized on the Hindu majority making decisions such as his opposition to having separate electorates. Jinnah emphasized on Muslims having separate electorates to ensure that they are not under the Hindu majority and can meet the needs of the Muslim people.

Gandhi had a more direct approach from the early 1920s where he started his civil disobedience act (1920-22). Although it failed, he did not hold back. He had become the undisputed leader of the congress by 1922. He had gained the support of a mass majority of people, not only Hindus. This would boost his campaign. For example, many supporters took part in the Salt Satyagraha from children to women and elderly. He inspired Jinnah, however, did not was not able to gain as many supporters as he became a prominent leader only in 1935. He was only able to gain supporters among his minority Muslim community. The 1937 Elections was proof of this as the Indian National Congress gained 8 out of 11 of the provinces while the Muslim League did very badly.

Gandhi and Jinnah had a similar approach in inspiring the Indians and making their respective goals seem appealing. However, how they worked behind the scenes was different. Jinnah was very quiet about his dream of Pakistan in the beginning but opened up about it at the right time when the Congress

resigned its provinces gained after the 1937 elections and lost most of its political power. Gandhi, however, openly spoke about his idea of satyagraha ~~to~~ and Jinnah from the beginning. Gandhi's approach in ~~the 1920s~~ ^{later} 1920 was almost impulsive, without a proper plan. As he gained experience, the Congress and himself made better planned decisions. Jinnah, ~~on~~ the other hand, had a more strategic approach where he planned his strategy and attacked at the right time.

In conclusion, Gandhi and Jinnah had ^{some} similar approaches in their otherwise completely different campaigns. Both leaders were mostly keen on the idea of non-violence ~~if not for some~~ with some slip-ups that led to hartals and violence. In the beginning they were willing to work together but this changed as their dreams changed. Both leaders kept the needs of both their political group and religious groups in mind when making decisions. Although, they started out as leaders at different times both were able to achieve their goals through different strategies and plans. Gandhi adopted ~~at~~ the method of opposition while Jinnah adopted the method of negotiation. Both campaigns and approaches taken were mostly different and thus led to 2 different outcomes.

This is a clear level 4 response. It has an explicit focus on comparison and draws out both similarities and differences. It is underpinned by knowledge which is sufficient but not extensive. The range is more limited which prevents it from achieving the highest mark. Hence it is mid-level 4 rather than achieving full marks.

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

Section A

- Make sure you are aware of the topics highlighted for the source question and have prepared for them
- A careful reading of the sources is needed so that the issues raised are clearly identified
- You must ensure that you draw out inferences, but these should always be directly linked to the source and not driven by contextual knowledge
- You should consider the nature, origin and purpose of the source

- Do not merely restate what the provenance says – think about how it can be used to address the question. In a, this requires a consideration of how it adds value and in b, this requires considering value and limitations
- Contextual knowledge should be used to support the answer, not to drive it, and should be made relevant to the enquiry
- Question 1a does not require a consideration of the limitations of sources
- It is unlikely that weight can be assessed by listing all the things that a source does not deal with.

Section B

- Spending a few minutes planning helps to ensure the second order concept is correctly identified
- Candidates must provide more precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses lacked depth and sometimes range
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Essay questions are set over a period of at least ten years; candidates need to address the whole time period set in the question
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues in order to make the structure of the response flow more logically and to enable the integration of analysis.

