

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2026

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level in History
WHI02/1A

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

June 2026

Question Paper Log Number P79229A

Publication Code: WHI02_1A_2606_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2026

General Marking Guidance

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

Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 2

Section A: Question 1(a)

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

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

Section A: Question 1(b)

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

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

Section B

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

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

Section A: indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
1a	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme.</p> <p>The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are required to analyse the source and consider its value for an enquiry into the reasons why Gandhi launched the 'Quit India' campaign during the Second World War.</p> <p>1. The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It implies that the protests made by the INC before 1942 were ineffective ('action that we took not really intended to damage the Government.')• It suggests that Gandhi believed that only direct confrontation would ensure independence after the war ('opposed a passive submission', 'Submission ... India's freedom would take a long time to achieve.')• It indicates that Gandhi launched the 'Quit India' campaign because of the nature of British rule in India ('British autocratic and repressive policy in India.')• It suggests that Gandhi launched the campaign as a wider opposition to colonialism ('If India remained unfree, ... other colonial countries and subject races would also continue to be enslaved.'). <p>2. The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nehru had a close relationship with Gandhi and was likely party to his private thoughts. He was thus well-qualified to comment on them• Nehru was a leading member of the INC that approved the 'Quit India' campaign and was therefore in an excellent position to comment on the reasons why Gandhi launched the campaign• Nehru wrote this account while the campaign was ongoing and published it shortly after the war, thus providing an immediate assessment of the reasons for launching the campaign. <p>3. Knowledge of the historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The INC, including Gandhi, had been greatly angered by the British decision to declare war on India's behalf in 1939 without consulting or informing leading Indian political parties• British repression in India became more stringent after declaration of war, with the use of surveillance on members of the INC and strict press censorship. Congress claimed Britain had lost the moral authority to rule• Gandhi believed that the 'Quit India' campaign would expose British repression on the world stage and would lead to the USA exerting pressure on Britain to withdraw from its colonies, including India. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
1b	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme.</p> <p>The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are required to analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into the reasons why General Dyer used military force at Amritsar in April 1919.</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evidence was given to the Hunter Committee, the official enquiry into the events at Amritsar, and therefore should give an accurate account • It is likely that Dyer would present the most favourable account of his actions to the Committee, which may affect the reliability of his account • The tone of the report is relatively neutral, reporting the evidence given without offering opinion. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It indicates that Dyer believed the use of military force was legally justified ('civil law was at an end and military law would have to take its place.') • It implies that a key reason for the use of military force was Dyer's belief that the proclamation had been ignored in spite of widespread publicity ("We did as much as we could.", "I thought I had done enough.") • It claims Dyer's use of military force was necessary because the Indian people had disobeyed his orders ('had not been obeyed. Martial law had been defied and he considered it his duty to disperse the crowd') • It claims Dyer's use of military force was necessary to prevent a widespread rebellion ("Communications I received ... indicated a serious rising. It was a military situation not limited to Amritsar.'). <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of the content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michael O'Dwyer, governor of the Punjab, believed that the rioting in Amritsar was the first stage of a carefully planned insurrection to overthrow the Raj and, therefore, he authorised the use of military force • Between ten and twenty thousand Indians gathered at the Jallianwala Bagh despite warnings issued by Dyer that he would use military force to prevent such gatherings anywhere in Amritsar • Dyer led his troops into the Jallianwala Bagh and fired 1,650 rounds into the crowd without giving any warning • In his testimony to the Hunter Committee, Dyer claimed that he did not want a repetition of the 1857 Mutiny. He was aware that the British position was relatively weak, with only 50 troops under his command. <p>Other relevant material must be credited</p>

Section B: Indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether the British responses to the famines in India in 1876–78, and 1899 were very similar.</p> <p>The arguments and evidence that the British responses to the famines in India in 1876–78, and 1899 were very similar should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In both periods, the British government was concerned that the cost of famine relief should not place a significant burden on the British taxpayer and this limited its response• In the 1876–78 famine, Lord Lytton refused to reduce food prices and instructed Temple to cut relief rations. Similarly, in the 1899 famine, Lord Curzon sent a circular to provincial governments urging them to apply stringency in famine tests and advising them against excessive generosity• In both periods, there were no public work schemes ready at the start of the famines, which would have enabled Indian people to work in return for government wages that could be spent on food• In both periods, large public work schemes were eventually introduced• In both periods, the British response was unable to prevent a high death toll, with between 5.5 million and 8.2 million excess deaths resulting from the 1876–78 famine and at least 6 million deaths in the 1899 famine. <p>The arguments and evidence that the British responses to the famines in India in 1876–78, and 1899 were different should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The British government was able to respond more effectively at the start of the 1899 famine because of the Famine Codes that had been established by the inquiry held after the 1876–78 famine• In the 1876–78 famine, the response relied mostly on local initiatives with scattered projects administered by the provincial governments. By contrast, in response to the 1899 famine, Lord Curzon organised famine relief for subjects of British provinces• Lord Curzon was more personally involved in dealing with the 1899 famine than Lord Lytton was in 1876–78. Curzon travelled to the famine-stricken areas, visiting the camps and the hospitals and seeing for himself how the relief projects were organised and operating• In the 1876–78 famine, a major problem was the death of livestock from lack of water and fodder. In the 1899 famine, the British government was able to respond to this issue more effectively by setting up ‘cattle camps’ and so save a greater number of livestock. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether the impact of Lord Curzon on advancing the growth of nationalism in India was greater than the impact of the Indian National Congress (INC) on advancing the growth of nationalism in India in the years 1885–1914.</p> <p>The arguments and evidence that the impact of Lord Curzon on advancing the growth of nationalism in India was greater than the impact of the Indian National Congress (INC) on advancing the growth of nationalism in India in the years 1885–1914 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curzon had a significant impact on the growth of nationalism because of his massive expansion of the railways. They improved communication and allowed for the circulation of newspapers promoting nationalism • Curzon’s University Act, 1904, was very significant in fostering nationalism in a key group – the Indian middle class – by its restrictions on private colleges. They regarded it as an attack on their interests by the British • Curzon’s partition of Bengal in 1905 was significant in advancing nationalism. It outraged Hindus and stimulated Congress into launching a movement for national unity, swaraj and swadeshi • The impact of the INC on the growth of nationalism was limited in its early years when its focus was often on co-operation. After the partition of Bengal, its impact was limited by divisions between Hindus and Muslims. <p>The arguments and evidence that the impact of the Indian National Congress (INC) on advancing the growth of nationalism in India was greater than the impact of Lord Curzon on advancing the growth of nationalism in India in the years 1885–1914 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Between 1885 and 1914, the INC became an effective vehicle to promote nationalism. It developed into a broadly-based political party, with delegates from across the country and representing the different religions • The INC’s strategy for achieving a share in government promoted the growth of nationalism. It published newspapers, held meetings around the country, which attracted large audiences, and lobbied MPs for change • The INC’s campaign of swadeshi, in response to the partition of Bengal, captured the imagination of the public and was very significant in promoting the growth of nationalism • After the formation of the Muslim League in 1906, there were many occasions where the INC worked with the League to encourage nationalism, e.g. the agreement to establish a joint programme in 1910. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether, in the years 1935–47, it was Lord Mountbatten’s actions that were the key factor that led to the decision to partition India.</p> <p>The arguments and evidence that, in the years 1935–47, it was Lord Mountbatten’s actions that were the key factor that led to the decision to partition India should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As Viceroy, it was ultimately Mountbatten’s decision as to the nature of Indian independence. He took the decision to partition India because of the failure of ‘Plan Balkan’ and his increasing anxiety over the situation • Mountbatten was influenced to agree to partition India because of the riots taking place in the Punjab while he was discussing independence with representatives of the INC and Muslim League • Mountbatten decided on Partition because of his desire that the British should leave India before the sub-continent dissolved into violence • Mountbatten’s actions regarding the Indian princes played an important part in bringing about Partition. He exploited his connections with them and exploited their fears to cajole them in to accepting Partition. <p>The arguments and evidence that, in the years 1935–47, there were other, more important factors that led to the decision to partition India should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Religious and cultural differences between the Hindus and Muslims were a key factor in the decision to partition India. There were fears on the Muslim side that they would be disadvantaged in a united India • The Government of India Act 1935 was a key factor in sowing the seeds of Partition. The Act provided for separate electorates, which were the precursor to Muslim control of the provinces where they dominated • The outcome of the 1937 elections was a key factor in bringing about Partition. It convinced Jinnah that a separate Pakistan was necessary, and he won mass support for this from Muslims • The withdrawal of Congress from Ministries in 1939 was a key factor in the decision for Partition. It enabled the Muslim League to work with the Raj and strengthen its position on the need for a separate Muslim state • Jinnah’s actions were a key factor in the decision to partition India. In March 1940, he called for a separate Muslim state in the Lahore Resolution and, in 1947, Jinnah insisted on Partition at all costs, including civil war. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>