GradeMax



Mark scheme (Results)

October 2019

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level in History (WHI02/1C)

Paper 2: Breadth Study with Source Evaluation

Option 1C: Russia, 1917–91: From Lenin to Yeltsin

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

October 2019
Publication Code: WHI02_1C_1910_MS
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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 1C: Russia, 1917–91: From Lenin to Yeltsin

Question	Indicative content
1a	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates are required to analyse the source and consider its value for an enquiry into the growing centralisation of power under Lenin. 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: • It provides evidence that the Soviet Republics have been united ('unite themselves in one federal state – 'The Union of Socialist Soviet Republics') • It indicates that the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics controls all the essential features of a government ('international relations', 'declare war', 'direct trade') • It implies that the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics has considerable power over the member Republics ('approve the budget of the federal state, which includes the budgets of the member Republics'). 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: • The 1924 Constitution was an official document detailing the legal relationship between the Soviets and the federal government • The 1924 Constitution was approved by the Second Congress of People's Deputies and outlines the intentions of the delegates • The language and tone of the Constitution make it clear that the Soviets would submit to central control. 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: • The Soviet Union was created in 1922, theoretically from independent republics but in practice they were dominated by the central government in Russia under Lenin's leadership through the agency of the Party • Power had been increasingly centralised since the Civil War when Lenin began to rely on loyal party *nomenklatura* rather than the local soviet officials • The important decisions were increasingly made by the institutions of the USSR, e.g. the Politburo, a party not a governmental agency. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
1b	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates are required to analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into the impact of Gorbachev's attempts to reform the Soviet economy in the years 1985–91. 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: • Pozner was an American-Russian and able to offer a perspective from one who understood both the Russian and American economic systems • The date of the source, written in 1990, five years after Gorbachev came to power, means that Pozner has had the opportunity to see some of the results of Gorbachev's policies • The language and tone of the source suggests that Pozner admired the work of Gorbachev. 2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences: • It claims that Gorbachev's reforms succeeded in reforming the economy ('changes … have been very dramatic', 'in the process of saving socialism in this country') • It indicates that Gorbachev's reforms have introduced capitalism into the soviet economy ('an element of private enterprise and private ownership') • It suggests that Gorbachev's attempts to reform the economy have met with opposition ('there are many who hate him') • It provides evidence that the bureaucracy in managing the economy had been reduced ('the decline of the once all-powerful bureaucracy'). 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: • The Law on State Enterprises allowed workers to elect their managers and gave enterprises more control over their budget and decision making in order to reduce the power of the Ministries in the economy • The Law on Cooperatives legalised private enterprises but they were hampered by continuing regulations and starved of resources so the outcome was limited • Results of reform were disappointing and, by 1988, poverty levels were rising and basic foodstuffs had to be rationed. Other relevant material must be credited.

Section B: Indicative content

Option 1C: Russia, 1917–91: From Lenin to Yeltsin

Question	Indicative content
2	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether the key features of agriculture under War Communism and the key features of agricultural collectivisation under Stalin were very similar. The arguments and evidence that the key features of agriculture under War Communism and the key features of agricultural collectivisation under Stalin were very similar should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Both War Communism and collectivisation involved the requisitioning of food against the will of the peasantry • The peasantry resisted both War Communism and collectivisation by hiding or destroying their produce rather than hand it over to agents of the Bolsheviks/Communist Party • Both War Communism and collectivisation resulted in a decline in agricultural production and widespread famine that led to millions of deaths in the countryside • Both War Communism and collectivisation were based on implementing the communist ideology in the countryside. The arguments and evidence that the key features of agriculture under War Communism and the key features of agricultural collectivisation under Stalin were different should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • War Communism was a policy adopted to ensure sufficient supplies for the Red Army and industrial workers during the Civil War, whereas collectivisation was a policy adopted to fulfil Stalin's economic ambitions in peacetime • In War Communism farming was based on small plots of land farmed by the manual labour of peasants and their families, whereas collectivisation involved the amalgamation of farms into large collectives that could be farmed using tractors from the newly-established MTS • There was a deliberate policy in collectivisation to destroy the so-called 'kulak' class • Resistance to War Communism led to peasant uprisings across Russia with one of the most serious in the Tambov province, whereas the systematic use of terror and the arrests and deportations prevented uprisings under collectivisation. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
3	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the extent to which the school curriculum changed in the Soviet Union in the years 1953–85. The arguments and evidence that the school curriculum changed in the Soviet Union in the years 1953–85 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The emphasis on technical/vocational education introduced by Khrushchev was changed back to an emphasis on academic subjects by Brezhnev • The history curriculum underwent considerable change: the official view of Stalin was changed to a critical view by Khrushchev in 1959 and Stalin and the gulags were removed from the curriculum by Brezhnev • Khrushchev introduced the learning of a foreign language into the curriculum. This was given less emphasis in the Brezhnev era • Brezhnev introduced change into the science curriculum in the 1970s to include the latest scientific knowledge. The arguments and evidence that the school curriculum did not change in the Soviet Union in the years 1953–85 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The importance of Marxist-Leninist Theory in the curriculum continued throughout the period and was compulsory at all levels of education • The promotion of the Russian language in the curriculum continued throughout the period • The curriculum did not distinguish between the sexes and boys and girls were taught the same subjects in co-educational schools under both Khrushchev and Brezhnev • Khrushchev's reforms focusing on technical/vocational education were only implemented in 65 per cent of schools, meaning that 35 per cent of schools continued to follow an academic curriculum throughout the period • Most of the curriculum remained unchanged; by 1985 students were still studying the same mixture of subjects as those established in 1947. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
4	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about how significant the clashes between artists and the government were in the years 1964–85. The arguments and evidence that the clashes between artists and the government were significant in the years 1964–85 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • In 1965–66 the state sent a powerful message that it considered dissent to be significant by the arrest, trial and imprisonment of Sinyavsky and Daniel, authors whose novels had criticised life in the Soviet Union • The treatment of artists whose ideas challenged the state suggests the clashes were regarded as significant, e.g. Solzhenitsyn was firstly imprisoned and later exiled for demanding an end to censorship • The government clearly regarded even implicit criticisms by artists as significant. In 1966, it added a new clause to the criminal code making it a criminal act to distribute 'false information harmful to the soviet state' • Lesser known artists, whose work criticised or deviated from the party line, were sent to institutions for 'repressive psychiatric treatment'. By the early 1970s there were 7000–8000 artists held in such institutions • The government took criticism by underground artists seriously. In 1974 an unofficial open-air exhibition was bulldozed by the police. The arguments and evidence that the clashes between artists and the government were not significant in the years 1964–85 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The majority of artists belonged to groups that adhered to the official line unquestioningly or who only expressed criticism through official channels that did not challenge the system • International disapproval of attacks on artists meant that some artists who were imprisoned under Khrushchev were released and, after the Sinyavsky and Daniel affair, show trials and imprisonment were rare • The government needed to use very little pressure to bring most artists into line. Those who strayed too far could be easily dealt with by a warning from a government official • In the 1980s the government made some accommodation with artists, e.g. Andropov allowed 20 per cent radio airtime to be given to songs that were not composed by official soviet composers. Other relevant material must be credited.