



Pearson  
Edexcel

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2019

Pearson Edexcel GCE History (9HI0/1E)  
Advanced

Paper 1: Breadth study with  
interpretations

Option 1E: 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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2019

Publications Code 9HI0\_1E\_1906\_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: Sections A and B

**Target:** AO1: 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.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is limited 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>8–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>13–16</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>5</b>	<b>17–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.</li> <li>• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li> </ul>

## Section C

**Target:** A03: Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate.</li> <li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the extracts.</li> <li>• Judgement on the view is assertive, with little or no supporting evidence.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate.</li> <li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the extracts, but only to expand on matters of detail or to note some aspects which are not included.</li> <li>• A judgement is given, but with limited support and related to the extracts overall, rather than specific issues.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>8–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts and shows some analysis by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences.</li> <li>• Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts.</li> <li>• A judgement is given and related to some key points of view in the extracts and discussion is attempted, albeit with limited substantiation.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>13–16</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by comparison of them.</li> <li>• Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge to discuss the views. Most of the relevant aspects of the debate will be discussed, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth.</li> <li>• Discusses evidence provided in the extracts in order to reach a supported overall judgement. Discussion of points of view in the extracts demonstrates understanding that the issues are matters of interpretation.</li> </ul>
<b>5</b>	<b>17–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors.</li> <li>• Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments.</li> <li>• Presents sustained evaluative argument, reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrating understanding of the nature of historical debate.</li> </ul>

## Section A: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
<b>1</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether the failures of Soviet economic policy outweighed the successes in the years 1917-53.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the failures of Soviet economic policy outweighed the successes in the years 1917-53 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• By 1921 War Communism had left the Soviet economy in ruins (e.g. the transport system had collapsed and industrial and grain production had slumped) and the Bolshevik regime was forced to abandon the policy</li><li>• Under the NEP, urban unemployment levels remained high, the 'scissors crisis' exposed economic weaknesses, and, by 1926, the Soviet economy had barely reached pre-war production levels</li><li>• The human cost of Stalin's economic policies was enormous – a huge death toll, mass famine in the early 1930s, extensive use of forced labour, reduced living standards, shortages of essentials and the loss of personal liberty</li><li>• Stalin's policies produced a skewed and distorted Soviet economy that favoured heavy industry at the expense of consumer goods, and emphasised quantity rather than quality.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the successes of Soviet economic policy outweighed the failures in the years 1917-53 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• From 1921, the NEP helped to consolidate the regime by improving living standards and offering rural Russia economic incentives that reduced peasant opposition to the Bolshevik regime</li><li>• Stalin's pre-war Five-Year Plans turned the USSR into a modern industrial state with an economic base strong enough to withstand the Nazi threat (1941-45) and overhaul major industrial rivals such as Britain</li><li>• The centralised Stalinist economy proved effective in mobilising resources for the war effort and converting industrial sectors to military production</li><li>• The Fourth and Fifth Five-Year Plans successfully restored the Soviet economy after the war, e.g. industrial production recovered quickly and urban living standards improved from 1948.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>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.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate it is to say that Khrushchev's approach to government was fundamentally similar to Brezhnev's approach to government.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that Khrushchev's approach to government was fundamentally similar to Brezhnev's approach to government should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both Khrushchev and Brezhnev's leadership relied on the support of the party oligarchy</li> <li>• Both Khrushchev and Brezhnev developed a cult of personality in order to assert their leadership and eclipse rivals such as Malenkov and Kosygin</li> <li>• Both Khrushchev and Brezhnev were determined to uphold key features of the Soviet system such as the one-party state, a centralised economy and the secret police; both avoided the Stalinist extremes of repression</li> <li>• Both Khrushchev and Brezhnev had a populist approach and attempted to widen mass participation in the system, e.g. party membership increased from 7 million (1956) to 11 million (1964), and by 1980 stood at 17 million.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that Khrushchev's approach to government was not fundamentally similar to Brezhnev's approach to government should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Khrushchev made serious attempts to de-Stalinise the Soviet system but Brezhnev ignored the Stalinist legacy and renewed the focus on the unifying effects of the Great Patriotic War</li> <li>• Khrushchev tried to reform decision making in the party by decentralising to regional bodies, limiting tenure and splitting the party into industrial and agricultural departments; Brezhnev reversed many of these reforms</li> <li>• Increasingly, Khrushchev took decisions without consultation, e.g. launching a new attack on Stalin without discussion in 1962; Brezhnev adopted a consensual approach and rejected 'subjectivism'</li> <li>• Khrushchev's approach to government generated opposition particularly among party conservatives; Brezhnev's more consensual 'hands off' approach encouraged greater unity and stability within the party.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

## Section B: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
<b>3</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how significant state control of the mass media and propaganda was in sustaining the Soviet regime in the years 1917-85.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that state control of the mass media and propaganda was significant in sustaining the Soviet regime in the years 1917-85 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• From the early 1920s, the Bolshevik press emphasised the achievements of socialism and the regime; cheap and widely available, these papers had a high readership, e.g. Pravda had a circulation of 10.7 million in 1983</li><li>• The development of Soviet-controlled radio in the 1920s enabled the regime to convey its message to the illiterate section of the population (65 per cent); later, apartment blocks were wired to receive Soviet radio</li><li>• The development of state television from the 1950s and the expansion of TV set ownership in the USSR provided an increasingly important mass propaganda channel for the regime</li><li>• The personality cults created by the mass media around Stalin, Khrushchev and Brezhnev; these personality cults built on traditional Russian attitudes by providing a figurehead popularly identified with the state.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that other factors were significant and/or state control of the mass media and propaganda was not significant in sustaining the Soviet regime in the years 1917-85 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The regime's attacks on religion during this period attempted to preserve communist control by removing competing belief systems, e.g. the anti-religious campaigns of the early 1920s, the 1930s and the years 1958-64</li><li>• Throughout the period 1917-85, the Soviet secret police acted to protect the regime and neutralise internal opposition, e.g. the Red Terror, the Great Purges and the suppression of dissidents under Andropov</li><li>• The impact of the expanding provision of social security benefits, housing and healthcare, particularly from the 1950s, helped to sustain the Soviet regime by addressing the issue of poverty</li><li>• State propaganda wasn't always entirely successful at winning 'hearts and minds' and the population became more adept over time at reading between the lines, e.g. the rich variety of popular anti-Soviet jokes.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>



Question	Indicative content
4	<p>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.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the extent to which government attitudes towards the family as a social unit changed in the years 1917-85.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that government attitudes towards the family as a social unit changed in the years 1917-85 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Family Code of 1918 attempted to undermine the 'bourgeois' idea of the family unit by making divorce easier and offering abortions; in 1927 the regime also acknowledged unregistered marriages</li> <li>• The social problems and family break-ups that followed the 1918 Family Code led to the 'Great Retreat' (1936) under Stalin, which aimed to restore the importance of the traditional family and the status of marriage</li> <li>• Under Khrushchev, government attitudes became more supportive, promoting improved conditions for families, e.g. increased provision of social benefits, including healthcare, housing and childcare</li> <li>• The Brezhnev regime showed a greater awareness of the social problems weakening the family unit and attempted to tackle some of them, e.g. the 1968 Family Code tried to address the high divorce rate.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that government attitudes towards the family as a social unit did not change in the years 1917-85 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After the 'Great Retreat' (1936) the Soviet government continued to adopt a traditional/socially conservative view of the family unit as central to society for the rest of the period</li> <li>• Soviet attitudes to the family, in practice, continued to impose the 'double burden' on women (domestic responsibilities and paid work) so that by 1960 49 per cent of the workforce were female</li> <li>• Soviet attitudes to the family continued to produce flawed and limited social policies, e.g. the unintended consequences of the radical measures of 1918 and the 1920s and Khrushchev's restricted social provision</li> <li>• Although the Brezhnev regime showed greater awareness of the social problems weakening the family unit, it essentially followed the pro-family social policies of the Khrushchev government.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

## Section C: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
<b>5</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the views presented in the extracts. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument.</p> <p>Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that the USSR collapsed in 1991 because of a nationalist resurgence in the Soviet bloc.</p> <p>In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <p>Extract 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In 1989-90, nationalist discontent within the USSR, spurred on by events in the Eastern Bloc countries and Yeltsin's activities, was undermining the cohesion of the Soviet Union</li><li>• Gorbachev's actions had unleashed 'people power' in the Eastern Bloc and his attempt to hold the Soviet Union together by creating the 'unifying' post of President of the USSR did not have the desired effect</li><li>• The heavy-handed suppression of demonstrations in the Lithuanian capital, Vilnius, in 1991 undermined Gorbachev and discredited the Soviet government.</li></ul> <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The USSR would have continued to exist had Gorbachev not attempted to reform the economy, political system and Soviet foreign policy</li><li>• The events of 1989 in Eastern Europe encouraged the most disaffected nationalities within the USSR (Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians) to demand independence</li><li>• Gorbachev played a significant role in the dissolution of the USSR because he refused to use overwhelming force against the independence movements and his reforms facilitated the pursuit of independence.</li></ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the USSR collapsed in 1991 because of a nationalist resurgence in the Soviet bloc. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Yeltsin used the Russian republic as a nationalist power base to undermine Gorbachev and the central Soviet government's position; Yeltsin also encouraged the demands of the non-Russian republics for independence</li><li>• The growth, and damaging impact, of nationalist discontent in key parts of the USSR, e.g. the Baltic republics, Nagorno-Karabakh and Georgia</li><li>• Gorbachev's foreign policy towards the Eastern Bloc encouraged 'people power' and self-determination rather than his desired 'socialist commonwealth'</li><li>• Gorbachev's insensitive handling of the national minorities inside the USSR undermined central government-republic relations, e.g. Nagorno-Karabakh (1988) and the Baltic republics (1990-91).</li></ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the USSR collapsed in 1991 because of a nationalist resurgence in the Soviet bloc. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gorbachev’s political reforms, notably the amendment of Article 6, effectively ended the communist one-party state and permitted other parties to be set up and contest elections</li> <li>• Gorbachev’s economic initiatives, such as <i>perestroika</i> and market reforms, undermined the unity of the USSR by failing to produce adequate supplies of food and consumer goods for the Soviet population</li> <li>• By ending the Brezhnev Doctrine, Gorbachev ruled out Soviet armed intervention in the Eastern Bloc satellite states; for the most part, he adopted the same approach to independence movements inside the USSR</li> <li>• Gorbachev’s promotion of <i>glasnost</i>, along with other reforms, assisted the development of internal nationalist movements that increasingly pressed for autonomy or independence.</li> </ul>