

Examiners' Report

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE
in History (WHI02) Paper 1C

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

Summer 2016

Publications Code UA041796

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:
<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Examiner Report WHI02/1C

Introduction

It was pleasing to see responses of a decent standard from candidates attempting the new AS Paper WHI02/1C Russia, 1917-91 From Lenin to Yeltsin. The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory two-part question for the option studied, each part based on one source. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts - cause, consequence, change/continuity, similarity/difference and significance.

Generally speaking, candidates found Section A more challenging mainly because some of them were not clear on what was meant by 'value' and 'weight' in the context of source analysis and evaluation. The detailed knowledge base required in Section A to add contextual

material to support/challenge points derived from the sources was also often absent. Having said this, although a few responses were quite brief, there was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer questions from Sections A and B. The ability range was diverse, but the design of the paper allowed all abilities to be catered for. Furthermore, in Section B, few candidates produced wholly descriptive essays which were devoid of analysis and, for the most part, responses were soundly structured. The most common weakness in Section B essays was a lack of knowledge. It is important to realise that Section A and Section B questions may be set from any part of any Key Topic, and, as a result, full coverage of the specification is enormously important.

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

Question 1

(a) On Question 1(a), stronger responses demonstrated a clear understanding of the source material on the reasons for the increased centralisation of power in the Soviet State by 1924 and showed analysis by selecting some key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences (e.g. centralisation would be beneficial to all). Knowledge of the historical context concerning the reasons for the increased centralisation of power in the Soviet State by 1924 was also confidently deployed in higher scoring answers to explain or support inferences, as well as to expand or confirm some matters of detail (e.g. the outlying areas of the old Russian empire had not embraced the revolution). In addition, evaluation of the source material was related to the specified enquiry and based on valid criteria to show the value of the source. Similarly, explanation of utility referred relevantly to the nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author (e.g. the Soviet Constitution was approved by the Congress of People's Deputies which implies majority support). Weaker responses demonstrated limited understanding of the source material on the changes to the reasons for the increased centralisation of power in the Soviet State by 1924, and attempted some analysis by selecting and summarising information and making basic/undeveloped inferences relevant to

the question. Lower scoring answers also tended to add limited contextual knowledge to information taken from the source material to expand or confirm some points but these were not developed very far. Although related to the specified enquiry, evaluation of the source material by weaker candidates was limited and often drifted into 'lack of value' arguments. Furthermore, although the concept of utility was often addressed by noting some aspects of source provenance, it was frequently based on questionable assumptions.

SECTION A

Answer ALL questions. Write your answers in the spaces provided.

Study Source 1 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

- 1 (a) Why is Source 1 valuable to the historian for an enquiry into the reasons for the increased centralisation of power in the Soviet State by 1924?

Explain your answer using the source, the information given about it and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(10)

Source 1 is valuable because it suggests that ~~under~~ capitalist systems 'are incapable of creating harmony between different nationalities', therefore a communist and centralised power would be needed to create 'harmony'. This is also supported by the ~~wording~~ claim of the source that 'only under the dictatorship of ~~proletariat~~ proletariat it has been possible to eliminate the oppression of nationalities'. ~~It is a given~~ This means that only a centralised government would be able to effectively rule Russia. The source gives another reason for increased centralisation which ~~is~~ increases its value. With the sentence 'But the years of war have left their ~~to~~ trace. Alone, the Soviet Republics are unable to deal with devastation and destruction of the forces of production.'



The source justifies the ~~use~~ centralisation.

~~The source~~ It suggests that ~~if the~~ centralisation was necessary to ~~a~~ reconstruct the economy. Soviet republics were indeed unable to reconstruct ^{after the WWI} ~~the~~ economy on their own. This is ~~is~~ again supported by the source. The source mentions that 'National economic revival is impossible as long as Republics remain separated!'

~~However, the source does not~~
~~mention about~~

However, ~~the~~ this source was taken from the Soviet constitution of 1924. Therefore, ~~it is not that it~~ ~~justifies~~ it may have selected the reasons of centralisation ~~which~~ only they wanted people to learn about, for example that ~~this~~ centralisation is ~~only~~ is the way of ~~guarantee~~ 'guaranteeing external security, economic prosperity and national free development of peoples'. This may be presented as a reason to gain the support of the ~~Soviet~~ Soviet people.

~~In~~ In sum, ~~the~~ Source 1 can be said to

a valuable source, however, the nature of the source tends to decrease ~~the~~ this value, as the Soviet Constitution is not an objective source and the reasons written in it may be written in order to secure position of ~~communist~~ Communist rule by gaining ~~support~~ support.

This is a level 1 response. There is a clear understanding of the source and relevant inferences are drawn and supported with source material. However, the evaluation of the source is asserted rather than developed and there is no use of contextual knowledge. Consequently this response is held down in level 1.

SECTION A

Answer ALL questions. Write your answers in the spaces provided.

Study Source 1 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

- 1 (a) Why is Source 1 valuable to the historian for an enquiry into the reasons for the increased centralisation of power in the Soviet State by 1924?

Explain your answer using the source, the information given about it and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(10)

The source is valuable to a historian as given its provenance we know that it is from the Soviet constitution, ~~the being the laws set out by the state~~ and is therefore an official statement of intent by the Soviet government, therefore its ^{one to be taken seriously} claims over increased centralisation of power. Referenced in line 14-15 "All these considerations demand the union of the Soviet Republics into one federated state" (This strongly infers a centralisation of power). ~~and that~~ Since it is from the Soviet constitution we know it is an official document which will have been agreed on by various members of the Politburo and therefore reason enough for the ^{implementation} ~~implementation~~ of increased centralisation of power. ~~The very fact that it is~~

Another reason why it is valuable is because it highlights the flaws of a capitalistic system "The capitalist system has shown itself incapable of creating harmony." This affirms ^{reason} ~~harmony~~ why the Soviet state will have increased centralisation of power, in order to avoid the disunity and inequality of a



capitalist system. So not merely highlighting the benefits of a communist centrally planned system, but also finding fault with capitalism giving those in the government who are exposed to the fact greater reason to support the increased centralisation measures which followed. Capitalism is referred to as "hate" and "inequality". The use of the word hate paints the capitalist system in a very negative light and will surely give Lenin a greater support for his centralisation plans.

We also know that 1924 is after the period of the New Economic policy, therefore the statement of hate towards capitalism will ~~definitely~~ likely change peoples feelings towards the policy and lead people ~~to~~ within the government to believe ~~in~~ the importance of a reform and a movement closer to complete communism by way of centralisation.

By referencing capitalism in a negative way the source is successful in highlighting ~~the~~ faults within a capitalist run democracy and ~~and~~ therefore infers fault with capitalism which will back up reason for greater centralisation in order to achieve ~~of~~ more in its political sense by establishing a greater influence over ~~on~~ all spheres of society.

The source also mentions the guaranteeing of external security which would ~~also~~ be achieved

by the establishment of a one party state. So we know that the historian can use the fact that regions, be it within Russia or within the U.S.S.R could rely on external security which would justify increased centralisation, and particularly make it more appealing for particular regional representatives.

So overall the source has been successful in portraying its case for increased centralisation given its heavy critique of capitalism and high appraisal of communism "Soviet republics to unite in one socialist family" and also highlighting the benefits of a centralised system. In addition to this the origin of the source and its audience confirm to us and a historian that it is a true intent of the government to implement such a policy of increased centralisation.

This is a level 3 response. There is a good comprehension of the source material and valid inferences are drawn and supported. Knowledge is applied to the source material to support it and to develop inferences and there is some sophisticated reasoning used to discuss the value of the source.

(b) On Question 1(b) stronger responses demonstrated understanding of the source material on the reasons why Boris Yeltsin was elected as President of Russia in June 1991 and showed analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences (e.g. Yeltsin's election was the result of popular support for his arguments for an independent Russia). Knowledge of the historical context concerning the reasons why Boris Yeltsin was elected as President of Russia in June 1991 was also confidently deployed in higher scoring answers to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge some matters of detail (e.g. Yeltsin represented radical Russians who stood for constitutional reform and a market economy). In addition, evaluation of the source material was related to the specified enquiry and explanation of weight referred relevantly to the nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author (e.g. the personal insight offered by the author). Judgements were also based on valid criteria such as Yeltsin's comments on the difficulty of being objective. Weaker responses demonstrated limited understanding of the source material on the reasons why Boris Yeltsin was elected as President of Russia in June 1991 and attempted some analysis by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question. Many candidates confused the election with the coup of August 1991 and offered knowledge that was out of period. Lower scoring answers also tended to add limited contextual knowledge to information taken from the source to expand or confirm points but this was not developed very far (e.g. attitudes to Gorbachev). Although related to the specified enquiry, evaluation of the source material by weaker candidates was limited and often lacked focus on either the 'has weight' or 'doesn't have weight' aspect of the question. Furthermore, although the concept of utility was often addressed by noting some aspects of source provenance, it was frequently based on questionable assumptions (e.g. Yeltsin may have forgotten details).

Study Source 2 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

(b) How much weight do you give to the evidence of Source 2 for an enquiry into the reasons why Boris Yeltsin was elected as President of Russia in June 1991?

Explain your answer using the source, the information given about it and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(15)

Source 2 gives an insight into the reasons for Yeltsin's election in 1991, however it is ~~the~~ questionable ~~of~~ the source ^{how much} to what extent

represents the opinion of the people ~~of~~ on why they voted Yeltsin rather than for other candidates.

To begin with, the source was published ~~is~~ together with the memoirs of Yeltsin, suggesting that it is a rather individual assessment rather than an objective evaluation. Also, Yeltsin

enjoyed great popularity, easing the publication of ~~a~~ ^{an} individual opinion ~~on~~ on a political issue, which might not be ^{absolutely correct and stayed unchallenged}

Moreover, Yeltsin argues fiercely against pro-Gorbachev candidates, suggesting that Ryzhkov and Bakatin represented the highly unpopular Gorbachev-era. After a period of unsuccessful economic and social reforms, ~~the~~ Yeltsin was definitely



a more promising candidate, however it is questionable to what extent this had to do with the role of Yeltsin himself or the political orientation of his rivals. Therefore, a historian might put less value into Yeltsin's evaluation of the other candidates, as the source is clearly ~~more~~ opinionated and not objectively evaluating the potential of Yeltsin's opponents.

↳ see page 8

On the other hand, Yeltsin goes into closer analysis of the people's way of thinking when electing him. This is a more valuable point of evidence as Yeltsin was a representative of public opinion, such as his role in the defence of Gorbachev against the conservative coup shows. Being an actual witness, his evaluation of the role models of the candidates has definitely got more weight. The fact that Gorbachev represented the end of the Soviet Union is ~~definitely~~ valid, as the ~~the~~ economic stagnation and the loss of political influence ~~at~~ in satellite states, show.

↳ towards the end of Gorbachev's rule

The need for democratisation is also a fact that supports the weight of the source: The elections were ~~at~~ "free", showing that Yeltsin probably represented a majority of the Russian people, having similar ideas and a different mindset than his predecessor or his competitors. So to speak, Yeltsin ~~is~~ gives some valid evidence to why he ~~was~~ had been elected, regarding the people's needs and the state of Russia at that time.

To sum up, the source gives a decent amount of evidence for why Yeltsin was elected in 1991, however it is not an objective evaluation of the other candidates. The source might only represent one point of view, however it is certainly valuable when enquiring the 1991 elections.

*The source shows that Yeltsin was actively involved in the process of election and its analysis, eg. the statement to why many people didn't vote.

L) Yeltsin also mentions rather conservative candidates, claiming that they wanted a return to the old regime of complete state control. However, here it is evident that Yeltsin ~~was not~~ didn't give a completely factual view but above all ^{rather} an emotional context, showing us that ~~there~~ not all of the information in this source is purely factual but also personal interpretation and political statement, being clearly in favour of democracy.

This is a level 4 entry response. Although the contextual knowledge is rather brief it does have focus on the question and there is a good understanding of the source material with inferences developed. The weight of the source is discussed and valid criteria established although the final judgement is not fully developed.

Question 2

On Question 2, stronger responses were targeted on how accurate it is to say that Stalin's policies towards industry and agriculture changed the Soviet economy to a communist system in the years 1929-41. These also included an analysis of relationships between key issues and a focus on the concept (change/continuity) in the question. Sufficient knowledge to develop the argument was demonstrated too (e.g. collectivisation, the destruction of kulaks, state control of industry under the Five Year Plans). Judgements made about whether Stalin's policies towards industry and agriculture changed the Soviet economy to a communist system 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 fairly simple, limited analysis of whether Stalin's policies towards industry and agriculture changed the Soviet economy to a communist system. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on change/impact or were essentially a description of the economic policies introduced during the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (e.g. peasant opposition to collectivisation). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 2 Question 3 Question 4

In the years 1929-41 Stalin undertook a series of reforms which were to change Soviet history forever. Stalin's principal changes were carried out in agriculture and industry. Stalin had inherited a backward country, with significant problems of various types: shortage of food, lack of industrial modernisation... Thus, he became determined to modernise the USSR. Indeed, he was determined to do so, no matter the human costs.

~~Stalin undertook~~

Stalin was determined to modernise industry; as Marxist ~~for~~ theory implied, the proletariat were the future of the USSR and the peasants were simply to obey to fulfil the USSR's needs in the industrial domain. In order to achieve this modernisation of industry, he needed the peasants to provide both a surplus of food (to sell abroad and finance industrialisation) and a surplus of workers (to work in industry). In order to do this he introduced collectivisation.

Theoretically, collectivisation was a programme to unite several independent farms and create

collective farms that would function more efficiently. This seemed to be in line with Communism; sharing resources to produce goods for the common good of the state. Nevertheless, in practice, it became a devastating measure.

Peasants were forced into these collective farms. Stalin's government had shown a lack of understanding of peasant life and traditions. Resistance to collectivisation became a serious threat and disrupted agricultural production to such an extent that it had to be temporarily suspended. Therefore, although in theory collectivisation seemed to follow Communist beliefs, it had to be forced on peasants and their life. This would show it was not trying to establish a Communist system of equality for the people, but rather, to establish complete control over peasant life and agriculture. This was hardly a Communist ideal. In reality, Stalin's aims were purely to provide finance needed to expand industry and catch up with Western powers. ~~It~~ As a result, it could hardly be considered a true Communist measure aiming to establish equality for all, but rather a measure

to benefit the government.

Furthermore, collectivisation failed to increase agricultural production. Yet "surplus" food was being sold abroad to raise finance for industrial expansion. This, along with peasant resistance and ^{the} inability to adopt modern farming methods quickly developed into widespread famine. Yet, the government's official line remained that such food shortages did not exist. As a result, no measures were taken to improve the situation. Millions of people died of hunger, while Stalin's government ~~became~~ remained silent. ~~and~~ This ~~Stalin had~~ decision to adopt official silence was due to, among other reasons, the desire to preserve Stalin's reputation. ~~This~~ Ironically, in a communist state such as the USSR ^{the} people were dying in order to preserve the image and reputation of one individual.

Stalin's policies towards agriculture could hardly be described as true communist reforms. Perhaps the official justification for collectivisation ~~had~~ involved Marxist and Communist beliefs, nonetheless, in practice, these policies of collectivisation had become an instrument



with which to control and repress the peasantry. Stalin's aims or practices were not in the true spirit of Communism, or any ideology, but ~~was~~ were focused in developing industry no matter the costs.

In order to modernise industry, Stalin introduced the ~~plans~~ five-year plans. In reality, these plans were little more than quotas or objectives to be met. There was little planning behind them, which was left to local officials. Industrialisation had been introduced in order to build up the USSR's ~~own~~ heavy industry and defence. Stalin's fear of foreign capitalist invasion was to be the main driving force behind these plans.

On the one hand, it could be argued that industrialisation was necessary to be able to defend the USSR against invaders and ~~the~~ enemies. In this light, the five-year plans could be viewed as a true Communist measure, as it aimed to preserve the system against "evil capitalist countries".

On the other hand, however, these ~~plans~~ plans did close to nothing to improve working and living conditions of the

people. Stalin was indifferent to the people's suffering. Moreover, he claimed that opposition to these plans ~~was~~ was selfish and any complaint should be regarded as treason. Yet again, Stalin's aims or policies seemed to contain little to no Communist theory at all, but rather Stalin's interpretation of communism.

The First Five-Year Plan was hopelessly unrealistic and 10 figures were rigged in fear of reprisal for not meeting targets.

Therefore, it is difficult to draw valid conclusions on the success of this plan. Nonetheless, careful study has indicated that there was a significant expansion in heavy industry; there was an increase in the supply of iron, steel or electricity. However, the plan ~~did not~~ failed to improve workers' conditions, wages or lives.

The Second and Third Five Year Plans had virtually the same effect. ~~The~~ An ^{expansion} ~~increase~~ of heavy industry yet the failure to provide a better life for the people. With industrialisation, Stalin did not only want to ~~build a powerful defence~~ ensure the USSR was prepared for a war against the

capitalist enemies that existed. He did too, want to prove to the Soviet people and the rest of the world that a Communist system could bring about a nation as prosperous as a Western capitalist system. ~~The~~ The introduction of such measures coincided with the Depression experienced in the Western ~~the~~ world, that had started with the Wall Street Crash in 1929. Stalin argued that a capitalist system would inevitably lead to destruction, and that the true socialist system would be able to prevail and expand. This ~~was~~ ^{emphasised the Communist nature} ~~was~~ ^{justification for} ~~the~~ of ~~the~~ industrialisation and reforms. Yet, industrialisation and the five-year programmes were far from being of a true Communist nature.

Furthermore, ~~some~~ some historians have argued that Stalin's emphasis on heavy industry lay in his desire to build an image of a strong and powerful government. Historian Sheila Fitzpatrick ~~is~~ described it as "gigantomania".

The five-year plans failed to improve working conditions, wages or lives in general. In fact, all these were worsened. Public housing was overcrowded and a hazard

to ~~health~~ health / workers' rights were further diminished.

Overall, ^{industrialisation} ~~the~~ ~~a~~ appears to have been largely due to Stalin's aims, ideas and fears. Furthermore, they did not benefit the workers in any way. In fact, they were terrorised through constant purges ~~and~~ and charged with "sabotage". Therefore, it seems extremely difficult to declare ^{Stalin's} industrialisation programmes as to have been designed to build a communist system. Despite the fact that it did ultimately result in the USSR's ability to defend itself (in the war with Germany 1941-45) it had had disastrous consequences on the population as a whole. Distress and terror were constantly experienced.

In conclusion, although Stalin ~~may~~ may have claimed his policies on agriculture and industry ~~was~~ aimed to create a "second revolution" in order to fulfil the first (of October 1917), they had little to do with the people or their needs. During collectivisation peasants were controlled, repressed and starved. In the drive for industrialisation, thousands were purged and terrorised. Additionally,



Stalin's aims did not involve the well-being of ~~the USSR's~~ the USSR's population but were centred on establishing his supreme and unchallengeable control, as well as building a war economy for the wars to come.

Consequently, Stalin's reforms of agriculture and industrialisation cannot be contemplated as ^{Sincere} of a Communist nature, but rather as ~~the~~ policies to increase control ~~at~~ disguised as Socialist reforms.

This is a level 4 response. It is particularly strong on the discussion of agriculture. Key issues relevant to the question and explored and developed with sufficient knowledge to address the conceptual focus of the question. Valid criteria for judgement are established and the argument is logical and communicated well.

Question 3

On Question 3, stronger responses were targeted on how accurate it is to say that the status of women improved in the years 1917-53. These also included an analysis of relationships between key issues and a focus on the concept (change/continuity) in the question. Sufficient knowledge to develop the argument was demonstrated too (e.g. employment opportunities in the Five Year Plans, role in the collectives, educational opportunities, political opportunities, marriage and childcare). Judgements made about whether the status of women improved in the years 1917-53 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 fairly simple, limited analysis of whether the status of women improved in the years 1917-53. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on change/impact or were essentially a description of the economic policies introduced during the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (e.g. women were still responsible for domestic duties). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 2 Question 3 Question 4

The status of women in the years 1917-53 saw great reforms as the leadership changed. Lenin has improved the lives of women tremendously and while the same can be noted under Stalin it was not to the same extent.

Under Lenin the Bolsheviks aimed to achieve gender equality as for them a communist was a communist regardless of gender. They saw marriage as a bourgeois institution and as a form of slavery because women were sexually and financially exploited by their husbands. Therefore they believed that without marriage they would achieve equality and in 1918 under the Bolshevik's Family Code they introduced a law making divorce easier and allowing women to initiate it without permission from their husbands. In addition the "baba" was banned - a derogatory word for a woman and women could now pursue higher education without having to ask their husbands. However the post-war divorces led to the USSR having the highest divorce rate in Europe. This right was also misused as men initiated 70 percent of divorces leaving leading to 7-9 million orphans. Abortion and contraceptives were allowed with abortion outnumbering live births in Moscow in 3:1.



The state also tried to help women with the double day with the creches, laundries and state kitchens. However this was unrealistic as they lacked the resources and it amounted to more than the national budget. Therefore we see that while the Bolsheviks had good intentions this did not transfer in reality.

In politics women were ~~not~~ well represented and hence the Zhetoidel was created, the women's department. As only 13 per cent of ~~women~~ ^{party members} were women. ~~However~~ The biggest achievement in politics was the right to vote that women received in 1918. This was a huge deal as in other countries women had fought for this right whereas in the USSR the Bolsheviks understood the importance of gender equality and equal opportunity. ~~It~~ However only 2 women were part of the Central Committee and one of them was Lenin's wife. Hence we see that in politics women were not present.

In order to achieve economic independence women should enter the workforce and this was helped by the Civil war with 70,000 women serving yet not having the top positions that men did. Millions of women worked in factories yet in light industry like textiles. The successes of the Civil war were marked

by what followed. As the men returned after the war women were often unskilled and lost their jobs being left in dire situations and turning to prostitution to survive.

In general the reason the reforms of the Bolsheviks did not achieve the desired result was because of the traditional and sexist attitudes that men had towards women that could not even be changed by Lenin.

& With the appointment of Stalin enormous changes ensued for women as now traditional sexual attitudes were reasserted, a change from Lenin's more liberal policies. Stalin wanted women to enter the workforce because he wanted to increase production and take individualism away as now women served the state and not their families. However this was not like Lenin for the economic independence ^{of women} or feminism but rather if a woman earned just 60 percent of what their male counterparts did. Collectivization had negative impacts on women as they had to carry its burden because men were transported to factories & due to social engineering or because they fled to the cities in search of better jobs women were left to carry out collectivization, 80 percent of workers in collective

farms were women. This often meant low wages and very hard work. In addition during the Second World War ^{800,000} women served as pilots, nurses and machine gunners a change from the Civil War when women did not do the work men did. Also, 89 women were awarded the Hero of the Soviet Union award for their service. Moreover in higher education only 20 percent of seats were reserved for women yet in engineering a male-dominated field this surprisingly reached 40 percent. Women 13 million women were employed yet this does not mean they entered the workforce because they chose to but rather it was because they needed it to survive. The wives of Party officials lived great lives, did not have to work but rather did social work. This is a success in terms of women living comfortable lives but they only achieved this through marriage which is a change from the reforms that Lenin brought to emancipate women from their husbands. Hence it seems that their was a change from Lenin's idea of equality in the workplace and as even though more women began working it was not done out of choice.

The Great Retreat signified a massive change to more traditional attitudes and restricted the freedom and equality that women had received during Stalin. Stalin encouraged pregnancy and had awards like 5000 roubles to mothers with eleven children. Also he discouraged divorce because he was ~~app not~~ angry with the increase of divorce under Lenin. Divorce was made more expensive costing 50 roubles and men ~~were~~ had to pay 1/3 of their earnings to their child and if they failed to do this they faced ~~2~~^{two} years in prison. Stalin also tried to introduce ~~re~~ romance and glamour into the institution of marriage with the following: marriage certificates were printed on quality paper as to emphasize the importance of the Union, wedding rings were once again available and ^{married} Party men/officials were given dachas and more spacious homes*. In addition Stalin took several steps in ensuring that women ~~did~~ were not fully in control of their sexual reproductive lives. A ^{clear} contrast to Lenin's policies of sexual freedom and equality, contraceptives and abortion were not allowed ~~re~~; ^{female} medical virginity checks were carried out, ~~male~~ ^{and} homo incest, ^{and} bigamy were re-criminalised and sexual abstinence was encouraged. Therefore it is clear that

* This achieved Stalin's desired result: 80 percent of men and 80 percent of women above 30 were married.

* Stalin's policies were a big change from Lenin's as they limited women's freedom and took a massive step backward. It in terms of equality. Once again women were not in control of their bodies, their ~~money~~^{future} or their money. All the progress that had been achieved under Lenin was wiped out and replaced with more conservative and out-dated attitudes. Under Lenin intentions were good and did genuinely ~~In conclusion a massive~~ achieve massive improvements for women yet Stalin only took away ~~the~~^{the} equality and freedom they received and worsened their lives. The only good he did was increase employment which was done for selfish reasons and not for the women though. In conclusion women's lives improved under Lenin and his more liberal policies and then worsened under Stalin and his change to ~~traditional~~^{his} decisions dictated by ~~set~~^{his} conservative opinion.

This is a level 4 response. There is an exploration of the key issues and an analysis of the relationships between the key features of the period. There is a real depth of knowledge that underpins the argument and a focus on change although this is not maintained throughout the answer. Valid criteria are established and there is a strong judgement in the conclusion.

Question 4

There were very few responses to this question

On Question 4, stronger responses targeted the extent to which attacks on organised religious beliefs and practices in the years 1929-64 resulted in the destruction of organised religion and included an analysis of the links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (consequence). Sufficient knowledge to develop the argument (1929 law, impact of collectivisation, impact of the Second World War, closure of churches under Khrushchev) was demonstrated. Judgements made about the extent to which attacks on organised religious beliefs and practices in the years 1929-64 resulted in the destruction of organised religion 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 fairly simple, limited analysis of the extent to which attacks on organised religious beliefs and practices in the years 1929-64 resulted in the destruction of organised religion in relevant period. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on consequence or were essentially a description of some policies in the relevant period. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was often evident, it tended to lack range/depth (e.g. limited comments Lenin's attitude to religion). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

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

Section A

Value of Source Question 1(a)

- Candidates must be more prepared to make valid inferences rather than to paraphrase the source
- Candidates should be prepared to back up inferences by adding additional contextual knowledge from beyond the source
- Candidates need to move beyond stereotypical approaches to the nature/purpose and authorship of the source e.g. look at the specific stance and/or purpose of the writer
- Candidates should avoid writing about the deficiencies of the source when assessing its value to the enquiry

Weight of Source Question 1(b)

- Candidates should be prepared to assess the weight of the source for an enquiry by being aware that the author is writing for a specific audience. Be aware of the values and concerns of that audience.

- Candidates should try to distinguish between fact and opinion by using their contextual knowledge of the period
- In coming to a judgement about the nature/purpose of the source, candidates should take account of the weight that may be given to the author's evidence in the light of his or her stance and/or purpose
- In assessing weight, it is perfectly permissible to assess reliability by considering what has been perhaps deliberately omitted from the source

Section B

Essay questions

- Candidates must provide more factual details as evidence. Weaker responses lacked depth and sometimes range
- Candidates should take a few minutes to plan their answer before beginning to write
- Candidates should pick out three or four key themes and then provide an analysis of (for e.g.) the target significance mentioned in the question, setting its importance against other themes rather than providing a description of each
- Candidates would benefit from paying careful attention to key phrases in the question when analysing and use them throughout the essay to prevent deviation from the central issues and concepts
- Candidates should try to explore links between issues to make the structure flow more logically and the arguments more integrated.

