



Examiners' Report **June 2022**

GCE History 9HI0 1E

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

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 2022

Publications Code 9HI0_1E_2206_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

Introduction

Once again it was pleasing to see candidates being able to engage effectively across the ability range in this 1E paper, Russia, 1917-91: from Lenin to Yeltsin. Candidates were generally well prepared and centres are to be commended for the wealth of knowledge that candidates deploy in their answers to breadth questions. Many of the responses were interesting and enjoyable to read.

The 9HI0 1E paper is divided into three sections. Both sections A and B comprised of a choice of essays – from two in each – that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Section C contains a compulsory question which is based on two given extracts. It assesses analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations in context (AO3). Candidates, in the main, appeared to organise their time effectively, although there were some cases of candidates not completing one of the three responses within the time allocated. A number of scripts posed some problems with the legibility of handwriting. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

Of the three sections on 9HI0 1E, candidates are generally more familiar with the essay sections, and in sections A and B most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept(s) that was being targeted by the question. A minority of often knowledgeable candidates wanted to focus on causes and engage in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. On the whole, candidates were able to apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner suited to the different demands of questions in these two sections in terms of the depth of knowledge required: section A questions targeted a shorter period and section B questions covered a broader time span.

Candidates do need to formulate their planning so that there is an argument and a counterargument within their answer. Some candidates lacked sufficient treatment of these. The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks and centres should note how these strands progress through the levels. Candidates do need to be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that they draw their evidence in responses from the appropriate time period.

In section C, the strongest answers demonstrated a clear focus on the need to discuss different arguments given within the two extracts, clearly recognising these as historical interpretations. Such responses tended to offer comparative analysis of the merits of the different views. Higher scoring responses explored the validity of the arguments offered by the two historians in the light of the evidence; both from within the extracts and the candidates' own contextual knowledge. Such responses tended to avoid attempts to examine the extracts in a manner more suited to AO2, make assertions of the inferiority of an extract on the basis of it offering less factual evidence or drift away from the specific demands of the question to the wider-taught topic.

Question 1

On Q1, stronger responses were targeted on an analysis of how accurate it is to say that the nature of Soviet government under Lenin and Stalin was fundamentally similar. These high-scoring answers offered reasonably even coverage between similarity (eg both used purges to remove 'unreliable' party elements; both used 'class war' terror tactics to consolidate their regimes; both controlled the mass media and other forms of propaganda such as the arts) and difference (eg the Stalinist system relied on a full-blown personality cult whereas Lenin's regime did not; under Lenin's government internal debates were permitted but, under Stalin, the party was reduced to little more than a 'rubber stamp' for the leader's policies). A clear range and balance was evident here too (across the period, and arguing for/against 'essentially similar') in order to examine and explore key issues. Judgements made about the similarity/difference of the nature of Soviet government under Lenin and Stalin were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a limited analysis of the similarity/difference of the nature of Soviet government under Lenin and Stalin. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on similarity/difference or were essentially a description of Soviet government during the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (eg little coverage of Soviet government under Lenin or the later Stalinist period). Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

The nature of government from 1917 to 1953 sees distinct trends and similarities between both Stalin and Lenin although the scale and consistency of the similarities can be debated, and will be in this essay.

9/8

It can be argued that the nature of both governments was underpinned by ~~the~~ the use of terror. Utilised as a form of control, both leaders undertook vigorous campaigns often to target a certain groups loyalty or usefulness to the government or to silence their opposition. For example, in pushing for civil war victory, Lenin aimed to present a wholly united front to his 'white' opposition and ensure absolute loyalty and efficiency in the red army - in doing so his first organised terror campaign emerged as the red terror 1918-21. Similarly, in Stalin's aim of a wholly united and unquestioning ~~society~~ party, the purges began. Further patterns can be seen in these examples as both

(Section A continued) Leaders targeted families; Lenin, families of his troops being threatened to ensure compliance and Stalin famously threatening the imprisonment of Molotov's wife to ensure total blind loyalty.

However it can also be said that the scale and extent of both leaders' terror differed as the purges, including 1936-38 Yezhovschina, killed over 13 million people and imprisoned over 24 million whilst campaigns of Lenin imprisoned significant amounts but were never organised enough to amount to such a death toll. Ultimately, it is fundamental that any use of terror defines a regime for the people living under it - the patterns and the precedent Lenin set is undeniable.

It can also be argued that both governments were underpinned by Marxist ideology and class-war elements. Specifically, this can be seen in the targets of labelled "class enemies" and the extent to which the ideological drive ~~and~~ behind fear the hatred of these enemies ~~is~~ defined both governments. Lenin basing most initial agricultural policy around ~~taking from~~ the ~~state~~ abolition of the kulak class is clear here. Similarly, Stalin's pursuits of not just

(Section A continued) kulaks, building on Lenin's campaigns against them, but doctors and writers and experts too. Under both leaders there was constant fear mongering over the bourgeois.

However it must be argued that Lenin did truly face an aristocratic and tsarist class of which to make a legitimate enemy whereas Stalin merely utilised the label to delegitimise any groups influence. For example he went as far as to declare that the freedoms given to artists under Lenin was bourgeois, in order to pursue a "cultural revolution" 1928-32 of constructivism and ~~and~~ art or cultural workers having to be sworn loyal to socialism.

This demonstrates ~~and~~ the extent to which Stalin used false ideology to actively control all aspects of society for fear of a made up "class enemy". Although, more conclusively it can be said that this demonstrates a difference in circumstance (Stalin had no Tsar or provisional government to defeat) but ~~not~~ a similarity still in the class-war nature of their governments.

It can further be argued that both Lenin and Stalin utilised controls of the media and

(Section A continued) pursuit of a cult of personality to a government-defining extent. Both leaders were portrayed as God like and heroic in their revolutionary pursuits, to the point that photos of Lenin were edited to include Stalin ~~as Stalin~~ ~~and~~ as to enable Stalin to further revel in the victories of 1917. Fundamentally this displays how Stalin's cult of personality built on the ideas and practices of propoganda that Lenin had established. Similarly the extent of media control follows this pattern as early in Lenins premiership he established Glavlit, ROSTA and a total ban on other socialist newspapers thereby pathing the way for the extravagant propoganda displays of Stalin that further coincided into significant censorship. However it must also be argued that the nature and aims of these methods of control and attempts at propoganda differed greatly. Lenin acted in pursuit of consolidating power for the party, as a newly established government after a violent revolution. It can be argued that censorship was to pursue lesser political chaos ~~and~~ and another ~~gov~~ popular revolution. On the other hand it is clear Stalin pursued merely personal power ~~in this~~ and arguably vanity in the depiction of himself presented by the even more ~~greater~~ censored ~~pre~~ press - depicted imager of

(Section A continued) himself played by handsome actors or dressed in white - more than images of the soviet people/governments ~~and~~ achievements.

Ultimately, with such different characteristics to their propoganda and the differing extent of their cults of personality, it is hard to argue a fundamental similarity but the clear pattern of Stalin building on the ~~estab~~ foundations of control that Lenin established is indisputable and those foundations alone display great similarity.

In conclusion the nature of both governments are fundamentally similar, often only differentiated by scale ~~pot~~ ~~it~~ ~~is~~ ~~the~~ ~~kind~~ which is only a matter of circumstance, not nature or intention.



This Q1 response secured high level 4 because it:

- (1) attempts to focus on the similarities/differences regarding the nature of Soviet government under Lenin and Stalin;
- (2) considers a range of features to develop the analysis eg the use of terror and control of the media;
- (3) reaches a judgement in the conclusion related to the criteria developed in the analysis.



Ensure that you cover the whole time period of the question whether you are approaching the question thematically or chronologically.

Question 2

On Q2, stronger responses were targeted on the extent to which the successes of Soviet economic policy outweighed the failures in the years 1921-41. These high-scoring answers gave reasonable chronological coverage and focused on both 'successes' (eg the NEP helped to improve living standards and dampen peasant opposition to the regime; the pre-war Five Year Plans turned the USSR into a modern industrial state; collectivisation successfully increased state procurements of grain to sell abroad) and 'failures' (eg by 1926 the NEP had barely reached 1913 production levels; collectivisation had a disastrous impact on agricultural production levels; Stalin's Five Year Plans produced a skewed and distorted Soviet economy). There was some depth on the issue of 'successes outweighed failures', and a consistent analysis exploring the interaction and/or weighing of these factors. Judgements were well-reasoned and thus considered criteria. Stronger responses were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to offer limited knowledge or limited analysis of the extent to which the successes of Soviet economic policy outweighed the failures in the years 1921-41, or a narrative of the Soviet economy during the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far or only offered one narrow aspect related to the demands of the question, eg the Five Year Plans. Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Firstly, there were significant successes of the Soviet economic policy during the years 1921-41. After the NEP was introduced in 1921 by Lenin's government, the agricultural sector had a massive growth, with grain production increasing from 20 million tonnes to 60 million tonnes in a matter of a couple of years. This was due to the fact that the peasants who were working on kolkhozes were allowed to sell surplus grain for profit, which was an incentive for them to increase the efficiency and the volume of production. This was especially important after the Civil War, as the Soviet government pushed for greater industrialisation, which saw people move from rural to urban areas like Leningrad and Moscow. In order to sustain a big growth in population in urban areas significantly more grain was required to feed that population, and driven by the incentives of profit the kolkhozes were able to support this growing population with a significant increase in the production of grain. Additionally, under the NEP the whole economy had a major rebound and saw unprecedented levels of growth. This was due to major infrastructural projects that ~~were~~ happened during the NEP, such as roads being re-built and factories being put in place. This helped the infrastructure to recover and increase the economic activity in the country. Lastly, under the NEP a small middle class has started to appear, who are often referred to as the "Nepmen". They were also a key part of economic growth in the country, as they set up market stalls and restaurants, which were an essential part of day to day life for the Soviet population and which also

(Section A continued) helped contribute to higher levels of economic growth.

Secondly, ~~the~~ there were major successes during the first 3 5 year plans under Stalin. The first major achievement is the increase in output of certain commodities, like electricity, which under the 1st 5 year plan increased by almost 10 fold. This was essential for the Soviet economic system, as more people moving into urban areas and more factories were opening up, which required electricity, and other commodities like coal, which saw a 2.5 fold increase in output. Without such dramatic increases in levels of production the Soviet government would not be able to sustain growth in output, which was an essential element for ~~the~~ Stalin's regime. As well, during the 1st 5 year ~~the~~ industrial centres like Magnitogorsk and Corke saw major expansions, with Magnitogorsk becoming the largest ~~production~~ plant for producing pig-iron in the world. This was seen as a major success by Stalin, as such centres is what helped to multiply the economic growth of the country, but also provided with a vital resource of raw materials which were essential to building military machinery to defend the German invasion in 1941. Lastly, there were major regional developments in places like Kazakhstan and Tajikistan during the 2nd 5 year, which was also another success, as it improved the levels of infrastructure ~~transport~~ in far away regions, which was another important element ~~of~~ of improving economic activity in the country.

However, there were failures during the years of 1921-41, for example during the NEP the ~~the~~ economic system didn't have a functional system of benefits, which was a ~~big~~ major blow to a population with incredibly high unemployment rates. This led to many social problems, such as wide spread prostitution in ~~major~~ major cities, ~~and~~ due to the fact ~~was~~ that many women had no other means of making money. As well,

(Section A continued) Corruption and black markets became a synonym of the NEP, as the population tried to make the most out of a market system.

Many goods simply wouldn't sell under the NEP market conditions, which led to creation of these black markets, which undermined economic growth. As well as this, Kuznetsov described it a "scissors" problem. This essentially meant that the price of grain was significantly higher than the price of industrial goods, which was a really bad thing as many citizens simply couldn't afford to eat, which led to several million dying of starvation in early 1920s.

There were also major issues with the 5 year plans. Firstly, the emphasis was on quantity rather than quality, which led to many goods breaking as soon as they ~~was~~ exited the plants, for example the tractors produced at the Stalingrad factory broke down within 2 weeks of being out of the factory. This was a significant problem, as this undermined the quality of the goods and thus economic growth in general, as a lot of machinery would just break before it was even used. As well, there were major issues with the usage of slave labour. The massive expansion of the gulag system was in the regions where there was a lot of industrial activity, such as around Magnitogorsk.

During the 1930s, almost 15 million people were sent to gulags and used as slaves, which had a very negative social impact of people living in fear, which contributed to a drop in productivity of labour. As well, slave labour is highly inefficient, meaning had these workers been free men the economic output could have been significantly higher. Additionally, there were problems concerning ambushes and corruption by the factory managers.

This was due to their desire to reach the output targets set out to them by Gosplan, ~~and~~ and if they didn't they could easily be sent to the gulag. As a result, they ambushed raw materials coming into other

(Section A continued) failures, which ~~stopped~~ hampered economic growth and didn't allow for proper development of industry.

In conclusion, I believe that the failures of the economic system during 21-41 outweigh the benefits. While the output did increase by a significant amount, and the country became rapidly industrialised, this came at a huge cost. The millions of lives lost during collectivisation, where Stalin purposely starved the Ukrainian region, leading to 4 million deaths alone in 1933, and the 15 million people sent to Gulags during the 1930s cannot outweigh the benefits of economic growth. It is true that thanks to the 3rd 5 year USSR was able to defend itself from Nazi Germany, but it is impossible to say that it wouldn't be able to do that had the economic institutions been more inclusive.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This Q2, level 5 response possesses several strengths:

- (1) it targets success and failure in Soviet economic policy in the years 1921-41;
- (2) sufficient own knowledge is brought in to assess the extent of success and failure eg growth under the NEP and Five Year Plans, poor quality products and the use of coercion;
- (3) a reasoned judgement is reached in the conclusion based on the criteria developed in the analysis.



A good conclusion does not just state the extent of success or failure but draws together the points made in the main body of the essay and shows the criteria used to reach a judgement.

Question 3

On Q3, stronger responses were targeted on an analysis of the view that the Soviet leadership's policy on the arts and culture remained remarkably consistent in the years 1953-85 and were focused clearly on change/continuity. These high-scoring answers offered reasonably even coverage between 'remarkably consistent' (eg throughout this period, the Soviet leadership expected art and culture to serve the needs and objectives of the communist regime; Khrushchev, Brezhnev and Andropov all attempted to clamp down on non-conformist artwork; the Soviet leadership tried to preserve cultural conservatism in the musical arts, notably Khrushchev's 'permissible' dances, Brezhnev's promotion of traditional ballet and Andropov's vetting of rock groups) and 'not remarkably consistent' (e.g. Khrushchev's policies on art and culture zig-zagged between 'thaw' and 'freeze'; from 1969 the Soviet policy of compulsory psychiatric treatment to control and confine dissident artists was rapidly expanded; Brezhnev pursued policies on art and culture that placed greater emphasis on the achievements of the Stalinist period and the Soviet victory in the Second World War). Sufficient knowledge was applied to develop an analysis and there was a clear range and balance (across the period and arguing for change and continuity regarding the Soviet leadership's policy on the arts and culture) in order to examine and explore key issues. Judgements made about change/continuity regarding the Soviet leadership's policy on the arts and culture were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to be generalised and often described aspects of the Soviet leadership's policy on the arts and culture in the years 1953-85 with limited focus on how these policies demonstrated/did not demonstrate 'remarkably consistent' policies. Some low-scoring responses devoted virtually all attention to one particular aspect (eg Soviet government policy on the arts and culture under Khrushchev), thus restricting range. Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

The Soviet policy's on arts and culture were both set on the denunciation of violence after Stalin's tight control. Therefore both Khrushchev and Brezhnev did not use violence to control arts and culture during their regt time in power.

It can be argued arts and culture did remain remarkably consistant as both leaders limited liberalisation of the media. Despite ^{Khrushchev's} ~~Brezhnev's~~ claims of a "cultural thaw" after Stalin's death, dissidents who produced works which were too radical in criticism of the communist regime, were banned. This was because Khrushchev wanted de-Stalinisation but not a loss of faith in the communist regime. This is similar to Brezhnev who focused on art and culture which were reminiscent of WW2. This was because ~~Stalin~~ Brezhnev wanted to celebrate the achievements of communism.

This shows how consistently both leaders maintained a small control of the media to stop mass liberalisation which could have

(Section B continued)

been damaging to the already weakening communist regime. However, Brezhnev remained more conservative than Khrushchev and set up a show trial in 1966, sending Singavsky and Daniel, two writers who flourished under Khrushchev, to labour camps.

It can also be argued that the leadership policy for arts and culture is inconsistent between 1953 and 85. This is because Khrushchev's liberalisation, to an extent, of the media led to an encouragement of people to write in to magazines such as the *Rabotnitsa* (the Women's Worker) and express their views. This backfired for Khrushchev as people exposed widespread problems such as domestic violence, abuse and prostitution.

This was not maintained by Brezhnev who focused on portraying an idyllic and perfect life through TV shows about citizens living in luxurious apartments. This was because Brezhnev wished to show the successes of communism and growth of standard of living, despite the fact it hadn't really occurred.

Therefore, a difference between exposure and propaganda can be seen between the two leaders during 1953-85. This was likely due to

(Section B continued)

the difference in goals between Khrushchev and Brezhnev. //

Khrushchev aimed to liberalise Soviet people by allowing true shows of Soviet life which links to his objective of destigmatisation.

Brezhnev however focused on nostalgia, using wwa as a figurehead of Soviet Success and shows his objective of maintaining and preserving Soviet ideas despite rapid stagnation of party members and economy.

Therefore it is ~~incorrect~~ accurate to say arts and culture policy remained consistent between 1953-85, but it's fair to say it was consistently bad and ineffective.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This Q3, level 3 response offers:

- (1) some analysis of continuity/change concerning the Soviet leadership's policy on arts and culture in the years 1953-85 (but the candidate offers limited range and depth on Khrushchev and Brezhnev);
- (2) mostly implicit criteria for judgement and a conclusion at the end that needs further development.



When planning your answer to a support/challenge question, make sure you have a good balance of key points on either side of the argument or be prepared to argue support and challenge within each key point.

Question 4

On Q4, stronger responses were targeted on an analysis of [the significance of the Soviet regime's attempts to improve the status of women in the years 1917-85](#). These high-scoring answers offered reasonably even coverage between 'was significant' (eg from the outset, the Soviet regime was committed to improving the status of women with decrees on marriage, divorce, abortion and equality in 1917-18; Soviet economic modernisation in the 1930s significantly increased the number of women in paid employment; Soviet expansion of higher education gave women greater access to universities and the professions – by the 1960s 50 per cent of graduates were women and by 1985 a majority of doctors were female) and 'was not significant' (eg early Soviet attempts to improve the status of women had little real effect – the divorce decree backfired because men initiated most divorces, often leaving ex-wives with children and no financial support; Soviet economic modernisation resulted in most women working in relatively unskilled, low-paid manual jobs with poor promotion prospects; the Soviet regime often explicitly endorsed the female 'double burden', including Brezhnev's pro-natal campaign and official criticism of 'absent' working mothers in the 1970s; the Soviet regime did little to promote women within the party or government mainly due to entrenched chauvinistic attitudes – by the 1980s only 4 per cent of the Central Committee membership was female). A clear range and balance was evident here too (across the period, and arguing for/against significance) in order to examine and explore key issues. Judgements made about the significance of the Soviet regime's attempts to improve the status of women were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a limited analysis of the significance of the Soviet regime's attempts to improve the status of women in the years 1917-85. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on significance or were essentially a description of the Soviet women's lives during the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (eg little or no coverage of the Soviet regime's attempts to improve the status of women under Khrushchev or Brezhnev). Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

During the rules of ~~St~~ Lenin (1917-1924), Stalin (1928-1953), Khrushchev (1953-64) and Brezhnev (1964-82), there were many attempts to improve the lives of women in terms of working lives, rights and freedoms, and political and educational opportunities. The most notable progress was made under Lenin. However, overall the changes were only slightly significant because many did not have long lasting ^{or} widespread impacts, which significantly changed attitudes. In this respect, education was one of the only aspects of women's lives which consistently improved.

There were many changes to working lives for women during this period. Generally there were more opportunities but inequalities limited their

(Section B continued) significance. Under Lenin the brief rise in employment for women was swiftly undone when the New Economic Policy meant women were fired more than men, and often resorted to prostitution: in the 1920s 36% of urban ~~men~~ men used prostitutes. This meant that Lenin's promise to equal pay made little impact. Furthermore under Stalin's regime women were on average paid 60% of men's wages for the same work. Other challenges women faced at work ~~to~~ included, sexual, physical and verbal assault. This reflects that while the number of women working in industry rose by 10 million between 1929 and 1940 during the Five Year Plans, it did not necessarily improve their lives because attitudes towards women in the workplace remained misogynistic. Furthermore, rural women ~~to~~ were overworked due to the burden of the triple shift. The lack of changing attitudes is represented by the fact that during Khrushchev and Brezhnev's time, they used young women ~~to~~ as sexual objects to lure men to the Virgin Land Scheme (~~1964~~ and ~~19~~ 1954 - 1964) and the BAM railway construction (1974-85) respectively. As a result, this demonstrates a lack of progress in terms of women's treatment in the workplace. In the long term, there were more

(Section B continued) opportunities for women. By 1985 most university staff, art and cultural employees were women. However throughout the entire period women were consistently restricted to typically female industries, and lacked opportunities for promotion. For instance, while Stalin increased the number of female tractor drivers, in the 1970s 70% of the poorest paid agricultural workers were female. Consequently, the working lives of women did not improve in a meaningful or long term manner, making any progress relatively insignificant.

In terms of the rights and freedoms of women, there was huge variation in the leaders' approaches. Under Stalin Lenin for instance, the 1918 Family Code made abortion, contraception and prostitution legal. It also liberalised divorce by allowing postcard divorce. However these liberties were short lived. Stalin reverted many of these changes during the Great Retreat of 1936, including banning abortion and contraception, and making divorce unaffordable. Stalin also used promotional campaigns to enforce the idea that women's primary role was to be mothers: a woman with over 11 children received 5,000 ~~at~~ roubles a year. This demonstrates significant regress, which reduces the significance of

(Section B continued) Lenin's reforms. Likewise, Khrushchev's allowing of abortion in 1955 and 1965 liberalisation of divorce were positive steps. He also gave women the chance to express their experiences of issues such as domestic violence in letters published in national magazines. ~~However~~ However, once again, the improvement in women's freedoms was short term: Brezhnev restricted access to divorce and abortion. Similar to ~~Stalin~~ Stalin, he promoted pronatalism and a traditional family unit. The reversal of attitudes is further exemplified by his propaganda attack on women, blaming them for the moral crisis, including juvenile delinquency due to their neglect of children. Consequently, by 1985 Andropov and Chernenko continued a regime with very traditional views on the role of women. The KGB continued to attack feminist groups such as the Almanac in Leningrad. As a result none of the progress made under Lenin or Khrushchev can be seen as significant because it was so quickly undone. In fact, it could be argued that there was no meaningful progress: for instance under Lenin the courts ceased to have power from 1921, meaning women's rights by law were meaningless. Under Khrushchev, there was

(Section B continued) also evidence of pervasive misogynistic views, with attacks on women who wore western fashion. Therefore from 1917 to 1985, very little progress made any significant change.

Politically, there was relative stagnation in the status of women. Alexandra Kollantai was the first woman to ever sit in a government cabinet. However, by the 1930s Party membership only included 16% women. This low statistic shows the lack of opportunities or respect for women in politics. Between 1953 and 1985, women remained at 4% of the Central Committee. This shows no significant rise. Educational opportunities consistently increased due to the work of the Zhenskdel setting up reading rooms and encouraging quotas to ensure women at all levels of education. This was very effective. In ~~1928~~ 1930, 28% of university students were women; in 1940 the quota rose to 40%. Therefore by ^{the} 1960s around a half of all graduates were female. Furthermore, despite being consistently lower than the male rates, literacy ~~at~~ also increased to over 90% in 1939. Consequently, educational progress was undeniably significant because it promoted widespread and longterm improvement.

(Section B continued)

To conclude, it is only slightly accurate that the governments' actions to improve the lives of women were significant. Throughout the entire period the belief that there were innate differences between men and women* prevailed, an attitude even held by Kollantai. This meant that employment opportunities increasing was negated by the poor treatment of women in these workplaces and their restriction to caring or 'feminine' roles. It also reflects ⁱⁿ the regress caused by the policies of Stalin and Brezhnev, in terms of the rights of women.

[* , which made women weaker and inferior,]

The only meaningful and long term improvement for women were seen in education. In terms of employment the changes were often not improving women's lives and politically, and in terms of liberties no changes made meaningful long term progress. Overall attitudes towards women and their role in society remained stagnant.



This Q4, level 5 response possesses several strengths:

- (1) it targets the significance of the Soviet regime's attempts to improve the status of women in the years 1917-85;
- (2) sufficient own knowledge is brought in to assess the significance of the Soviet regime's attempts eg the level and nature of female employment and the Soviet record on women's rights and freedoms;
- (3) a reasoned judgement is reached in the conclusion based on the criteria developed in the analysis.



If you use the key phrases from the question throughout your essay, this will help you to write a relevant, analytical response.

Question 5

Stronger responses developed a clear extract-based analysis of the extent to which the USSR collapsed in 1991 because 'reform produced crisis'. Such responses explored most of the arguments raised within the extracts (eg by 1989 the impact of Gorbachev's reforms posed a serious threat to the USSR; Gorbachev was not prepared to jeopardise these reforms by forcibly suppressing nationalist movements; in the 1980s the Soviet economy was stagnating, a problem compounded by the unexpected fall in oil prices; nationalist politicians, sensing that Soviet authority was wavering, pressed for independence and national rights). Contextual knowledge was also used effectively to examine the merits/validity of the interpretations provided in the extracts (eg Gorbachev's reforms divided the CPSU into factions with hardliners/moderates resisting change and radicals urging faster reform; glasnost discredited the Soviet system with revelations about the state of the economy and the extent of Stalinist terror; between 1981 and 1988 the real value of crude oil fell by 90 per cent, deepening the economic crisis in the USSR; Gorbachev's belated attempts to create a new union in 1990-91 failed to halt the nationalists' momentum). The best responses were able to note that nationalist resurgence and the role of Gorbachev were key elements of both extracts and develop the analysis using these links. These responses also came to a reasoned judgement on the given view, referencing the views in the extracts; this is essential to meet the requirement for bullet point 3 in the mark scheme.

Weaker candidates showed some understanding of the extracts but tended to select quotations or describe what was in the extracts. Quite often these candidates only read the first few sentences of each interpretation commenting mainly on Gorbachev's attitude to reform from extract 1 and the state of the Soviet economy from extract 2. This meant that many responses failed to comprehend or analyse the material in the extracts relating to the actual reform process or the nationalist resurgence in the late 1980s. In addition, some candidates claimed that the extracts failed to mention Yeltsin. It is vital that candidates read and use all the material available to them in the extracts. In the weaker responses, contextual knowledge was mainly used to expand on the information already in the extract rather than to analyse the views being put forward by the historians. Examiners also noted that candidates were often unable to distinguish between the East European satellite states of the USSR and the Soviet republics. Weaker responses were also often limited in development, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements. Some candidates described and commented on both extracts with some discrimination but then suggested a completely different reason for the collapse of the USSR from their own knowledge in two or three lines at the end of the answer leading to a conclusion based on this evidence only.

5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the USSR collapsed in 1991 because 'reform produced crisis' [Extract 1, line 1]?

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

(20)

~~Both Extract 1 and Extract 2 acknowledge that Soviet leadership was wrong in ^{their} initiating of reform. Have~~

Both Extract 1 and Extract 2 acknowledge that the counterproductive reforms initiated by Soviet leadership caused the collapse of the USSR. However, Extract 2 has a conflicting view to Extract 1 in this that Extract 2 argued that the stagnation of Brezhnev's era could only have been recovered by initiating reforms that pose risk. Extract 1, however, holds a contrasting view by claiming that 'the Soviet Union did not need reform as neither the Soviet system, nor the Soviet state was in crisis and that reforms should have never happened as they "reforms produced crisis".'

Extract 1 is correctly pointing out that in 1985, the Soviet system was not in danger. Indeed, the economy stagnated, but the

(Section C continued)

late Brezhnev era did not cause social unrest and living standards, although slowly, were improving. This was part of Brezhnev's social contract. The Communist Party exerted total control over all republics and nationalism really was not an issue. However, Extract 1 is limited to the belief that reform was unneeded. The dominance of Russians in Politburo under Brezhnev, and in the army were really a problem that if not outbreak in 1985 could have ~~come to become~~ become at a later stage. In this Extract 2 ~~is~~ incorrectly implies that reform was needed, but carried risks.

The economic stagnation and the failure of the economy to be boosted were major reasons to the break willingness of Gorbachev to initiate reforms, first with *Ukrovenie* and thereafter with *Perestroika*.

Extract 2, therefore, blames the external factors that made Gorbachev's reforms to fail. Extract 1 holds a different interpretation by emphasizing the weaknesses of Gorbachev's reforms to as a reason for the collapse. Extract 2 concludes rightfully that the

(Section C continued)

drop in oil prices was a reason for the failure of Gorbachev's reforms. By getting into more debt, the Soviet government could not fund the desired ^{technological} modernisation which was the heart of Uskovic. On the other hand, Extract 1 correctly argues that Gorbachev's reforms were disastrous as Perestroika and Demokratisatsiya were reforms that were not influenced by external factors, it was Gorbachev's failure to foresee the disastrous consequences of his reforms. The May election of 1989 indeed resulted in more nationalist leaders gaining seats in the Parliament such as Yeltsin and Yakovlev who opposed Gorbachev's reforms and favoured independence of the republics. That was essentially within Gorbachev's control to foresee that, however he was incompetent and when Extract 1 is right in saying that Gorbachev wanted to dismantle the Soviet communist system as he introduced Glasnost and reforms to democratize the system. However he did not want to see the breakup of the Soviet state and suppressed

(Section C continued)

growing nationalism. The Tbilisi Massacre of 1989 is a good example for that. Soviet troops killed 30 people who were protesting and seeking Georgian independence. Another military intervention happened in January 1991 when Soviet troops entered Lithuania to restore order and retain Lithuania in the Union by not accepting the declaration of independence. In this sense, Extract 1 correctly identifies that some of the reforms of Gorbachev were disastrous. However, Extract 2 is also right by concluding that some of Gorbachev's reforms were due to external factors such as the global drop in oil prices which was crucial source of finance for the Soviet Union. Extract 2 also points out to some of the failures of Gorbachev such as allowing competitive election. Yeltsin was elected President of the Russian Republic in June 1991, and pursued a policy of Russian nationalism and favoured free-market economy. That did not happen earlier, but as nationalist leaders saw the erosion

(Section C continued)

of the Soviet political system they began to claim their own authority by raising the issue of nationalism. This is exactly what Extract 2 points to and the another unsuccessful reform was the establishment of the CIS in 1991, but it was evident that his reforms backfired and led to the destruction of the Soviet system. Here is where the ~~two~~ extracts intersect - the failure of Gorbachev to deal with nationalism.

In conclusion, that the USSR collapse in 1991 was due to "reform produced crisis" is well supported as both Extract 1 and Extract 2 acknowledge the disastrous handling of ^{rising} nationalism as central to the breakup of the Soviet Union. While Extract 1 believes that there was the reforms of Gorbachev and his inability of him and his colleagues to produce adequate reforms, Extract 2 ^{argues} believes that there were also external factors that were unpredictable and were the main cause for the failure of the USSR. Most importantly, Extract 2 claims that Gorbachev's reforms were necessary

(Section C continued) and but he was overtaken by events. However, both Extract 1 and Extract 2 are united in their understanding that reform produced crisis. Extract 1 puts the blame on Gorbachev's political reforms such as Glasnost and Perestroika which allowed greater freedoms in a system destined to collapse. Therefore the view is convincing that reform



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This Q5, level 5 response possesses several obvious strengths:

- (1) it offers a clear understanding of the extracts and uses this to develop an analysis based on the two competing views;
- (2) it uses own knowledge effectively to examine the merits of these views;
- (3) it is focused on the precise issue (the USSR collapsed in 1991 because 'reform produced crisis') rather than the general controversy concerning the fall of the Soviet Union;
- (4) it offers a reasoned judgement on the given issue, which references the views given in the Brown and Edwards extracts.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Use the extracts as the basis for a discussion of the view in the question rather than just selecting and explaining some of the key points in the extracts.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice.

Features commonly found in section A/B responses which were successful within the higher levels were:

- Candidates paying close attention to the date ranges in the question.
- Sufficient consideration being given to the issue focused upon in the question.
- Candidates explaining their judgement fully.
- Focusing carefully on the second-order concept(s) targeted in the question.
- An appropriate level of knowledge, in terms of depth of detail and supported analysis, eg a realistic amount to enable a balanced and rounded answer on breadth questions.
- Evidence of planning.

Common issues which hindered performance in section A/B were:

- Paying little heed to the precise demands of the question, eg writing about the topic without focusing on the question or attempting to give an answer to a different question than the one that has been asked.
- Answering a question without giving sufficient consideration to the given issue in the question, eg looking at other causes, consequences, with only limited reference to the issue/factor/key feature given in the question.
- Failure to consider the date range as specified in the question.
- Assertion of change, causation etc while using the formulaic repetition of the words of the question.
- A judgement not being reached or explained.
- A lack of sufficient supporting detail.

Features commonly found in section C responses which were successful within the higher levels are:

- Candidates paying close attention to the precise demands of the question.
- Thorough use of the extracts (though this need not mean using every point they raise).
- A confident attempt to use the two extracts together, such as consideration of their differences, comparison of their arguments, or evaluating their relative merits.
- Careful use of own knowledge; clearly selected to relate to the issues raised within the sources and confidently used to examine the arguments made.
- Careful reading of the extracts.
- Attempts to see beyond the obvious differences between sources, such as, consideration of the extent to which they disagreed, or where appropriate, an attempt to reconcile their arguments.
- Confident handling of the extracts allied to a sharp focus on the arguments given, recognising the distinct skills demanded by AO3.
- Evidence of planning using the extracts as the basis of the answer.

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

