



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level
In History (WHI02) Paper 1C

Paper 2: Breadth Study with Source Evaluation

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

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

January 2019

Publications Code WHI02_1C_1901_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

Introduction

It was pleasing to see a range of well-informed and well-written responses from candidates on IAS Paper WHI02 1C which covers the option 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.

It is pleasing to note that in Section A some candidates demonstrated an understanding what was meant by 'value' in question 1a) in the context of source analysis in this session. However, many still continue to write about limitations to the source and since this is not covered by 'value' and hence not rewarded in the mark scheme, means that candidates disadvantage themselves in terms of the time take to develop such arguments which impacts on the time they have to spend on the rest of the paper. Candidates are also still struggling with the concept of 'weight' in question 1b). Candidates need to approach weight by considering the reliability of the source. This can be measured in terms of the trustworthiness of the provenance and/or the accuracy of the content. Hence candidates should explore the strengths and limitations of the source and on then, based upon their judgements ascribe weight to the source. Many candidates also make use of contextual knowledge to expand on the detail in the sources, and make limited use of the context to develop reasoned inferences and to discuss what can be gained from the source. This limits achievement in bullet point 2 of the mark scheme and impacts on the overall mark rewarded.

In Section B, some candidates produced descriptive essays which had limited of analysis, but more responses were soundly structured. The most common weakness in Section B essays was the lack of a sharp focus on the precise terms of the question and/or the second order concept that was targeted.

It remains important to realise that Section A topics are drawn from highlighted topics on the specification whereas 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. There was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer questions from Sections A and B.

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

Question 1a)

The majority of responses achieved level 2 and a good proportion entered level 3. These responses demonstrated an understanding of the source material and an ability to draw and develop inferences from the material using their contextual knowledge to explain inferences as well as expanding on matters in the source. Valid comments were made on the provenance of the source and value explained. The common features of responses that could not access level three were use of contextual knowledge to expand upon material in the source (this was usually presented in a separate paragraph) and a lack of discussion on the value of the source. It is important that candidates do reach a judgement on the value. Candidates should not, therefore, focus on addressing the enquiry itself but on the value of the source to an historian making the enquiry. Candidates need to step back and consider why the source would be valuable. Those candidates who achieve this score well in level three. There is no reference to the limitations of the source in the question and mark scheme and therefore comments on lack of value should be avoided.

Source 1 is highly valuable for an enquiry into the significance of the policy of liberalisation under Khrushchev because as mentioned in the provenance, it was written by ^{Mikhail} Gorbachev making it a primary source. As regional deputy of ~~the~~ part of the Soviet youth group, Gorbachev would have been very close to the source and would know things from behind the scenes making the source very valuable. Further the provenance states that he had "access to the full text of the secret speech" this allowed him, Mikhail Gorbachev to know the plans and goals Khrushchev had with the policy of liberalisation adding more value to the source. As a deputy of the Komsomol, Gorbachev ~~was~~ had insight into why and how Khrushchev was planning on moving the USSR more liberal, giving the people more rights than they have had under Stalin.

Moreover, Source 1 is valuable for an enquiry into the significance of the policy of liberalisation under Khrushchev because it shows the ~~reaction~~ ^{impact it had on the population.} people had. "The actual consequences of Khrushchev's political actions were crucial" this proves that Khrushchev's attempt to de-Stalinise the USSR, did bring a reaction. The Source also shows, that it did help the people "Khrushchev must be given credit too for the rehabilitation of thousands of people!" He tried to take away fear that grew throughout the whole USSR under Stalin. He wanted to allow people to be more free and to "modernise the Party" in order to bring change, something the USSR was in desperate need of. This shows, that Source 1 ~~can be~~ is very valuable for an enquiry into the significance of the policy of liberalisation under Khrushchev, by stating the plans and achievements Khrushchev had during his time as leader of the ~~party~~ Party. It also shows why this policy was a failure "he still faced bitter resistance that led to his eventual defeat." Although this

shows his failure, it adds value to Source 1 for an enquiry into the significance of the policy of liberalisation under Khrushchev.

Overall, Source 1 must be given a lot of value for an enquiry into the significance of the policy of liberalisation under Khrushchev due to it being, as mentioned in the provenance, a primary source written by Mikhail Gorbachev who was a regional deputy in the Komsomol. It also gains value as it states the reasons why Khrushchev wanted the liberalisation and why it was a failure.

This is a low level 3 response. The answer draws out a couple of inferences in the second paragraph which are supported by the evidence in the source. The provenance is used to make valid comments about the reliability of the source. However, the contextual knowledge is used to expand on the details in the source rather than to develop inferences and hence the answer achieves level 2 in bullet point 2 which holds this at low level three.

Source 1 is valuable ~~to~~ to a historian ~~for~~ for an enquiry into the significance of the policy of liberalisation under Khrushchev due to its provenance. The source is written by Gorbachev, the last leader of the USSR, in 1995, after the fall of the Soviet Union. Gorbachev also attempted reforms on the Party in a similar way Khrushchev did, in order to weaken the Stalinist system therefore will be having access to all ~~relevant~~ historical resources of the Party as well as being member of the Komzond during Khrushchev leadership he would be on a very reliable position in to comment about the significance of Khrushchev's policies as when he would undertake a similar pathway to reform the Party and not make the same mistakes than Khrushchev.

When Gorbachev says that 'The criticism of Stalin discredited totalitarianism and aroused hopes ~~for~~ reform' we can infer that a consequence of his policy was that de-Stalinisation was going to occur and the system of censorship was going to be removed. This can be demonstrated as books like

'The Thaw' or 'Not by Bread Alone' which criticised Stalin's bureaucracy and terror system were able to be sold in bookshops with no restrictions. This is significant because it shows Khrushchev policy brought freedom of speech to the Soviet Union and therefore ~~notifies~~^{gives} source of value for an enquiry into the significance of the policy of liberalisation.

Moreover, when Gorbachev says liberalisation enabled 'the restoration of the good name of ^{hundreds of} thousands of innocent people' we can infer that another significant consequence of liberalisation was that ~~thousands~~ people who were falsely accused during the Stalinist regime were reintroduced in normal conditions in civil ~~rights~~ life. This is demonstrated by the fact that between 1953-54 Khrushchev released 2 million political prisoners from gulags. This is significant because it demonstrates the willingness for reform that Khrushchev was approaching through de-Stalinisation and gives the source more value ~~for~~ an enquiry into the significance of liberalisation policy.

Furthermore, when Gorbachev says that 'he still faced bitter resistance' we can infer that liberalisation under Khrushchev's significance wasn't ~~very~~ large due to the entrenched Stalinist system and Communist Party officials. This can be seen as the Anti-Group opposition was ~~formed~~ during

Khrushchev leadership which demonstrates the high level of opposition from the elite and therefore give even more weight to Source 1 for an enquiry into the significance of liberalisation policy.

Overall, source 1 has value for an enquiry into the significance of liberalisation under Khrushchev as its provenance is a source full of knowledge about reform, Gorbachev and also because we can infer that this policy had a heavy social significance as enabled freedom of speech but also shows that its significance was limited by high level of opposition within the party.

This is a high level three response. Inferences are drawn out about the release of prisoners and on opposition to liberalisation within the party. In this response the contextual knowledge is used to develop the inferences rather than to expand as in the previous example. Relevant discussion of the provenance and the value of the source mean that this response achieves level three in all bullet point and is therefore a high level three.

Question 1b)

Most candidates were able to achieve level three in response to this question and there were some good answers that entered level 4. In question 1b, candidates need to evaluate the weight of the source in relation to the enquiry. This requires them to investigate the strengths and limitations of the source and to reach a judgement. In the case of level three answers, the judgement is often undeveloped or not explained. Collectivisation is a very

familiar topic to candidates but this does come with pitfalls – many candidates are eager to display their depth of knowledge on the topic and develop very lengthy description of collectivisation from their knowledge. This is not a successful approach and leads to achievement at level one or level two in bullet point 2 because at best the contextual knowledge is used for support of expansion and not to interrogate the evidence in the source. The better approach is to use the context to illuminate what could therefore be gained from the source. Some candidates made good use of the authorship of the source and its implications to develop an evaluation and judgement that was based on valid criteria.

When from source 2 we read 'result has been the tragic ruin of Russian agriculture' we can infer that the policy of collectivisation has had a devastating effect on the countryside. This can be seen as grain production had fell from 73.3 million tonnes in 1928 to 67 million tonnes by 1932, which is significant as it demonstrates the state of terminal sickness that soviet agriculture was suffering and therefore gives ~~more~~ weight to source 2 for an enquiry into the impacts of collectivisation. Moreover when Sorens says 'swollen bellies associated with famine' we can infer that the soviet population was starving to death, and this can be seen as 6 million people had died due to famine between 1932-33 as well as another 5 million in Ukraine due to Holodomor (murder of Ukrainians by starvation). This is significant because it shows agricultural production was not able to feed its own population and therefore shows that the impact of collectivisation had been disastrous which gives weight to source 2 for an enquiry into the impact of collectivisation.

However, when Sorez says that 'the potatoes left are being counted one by one' we can infer that agricultural production was at its lowest, but this is not completely accurate, this can be seen as the private plots that were left were producing 410 kilos per hectare compared to the 320 kilos of collective farms. This is significant as it shows that to some extent Sorez is exaggerating the ~~final~~ impact of collectivisation which is not completely true as private plots were supporting collective production. Therefore this gives less weight to ~~some 2~~ an enquiry into the impacts of collectivisation.

According to the prologue, as this article is written in 1933, at this time the effects of collectivisation would be already seen in the countryside that Sorez visited as it was implemented since 1929 therefore this gives ~~some 2~~ ^{some 2} weight ~~to~~ an enquiry into the impact of collectivisation. Because visual effects would be ~~the~~ clear and objective in order to make a reliable judgement about the effects of collectivisation.

However, as the provenance is from a British newspaper, its purpose would be to denounce Soviet atrocities and be critical about Stalin policies due to ideological reasons of capitalism vs Communism. ^{in order to create hate towards the Soviets among British population} And as we can see Source 1 is critical throughout the whole extract showing no positive impact to balance his argument. Source 2 has weight here for an enquiry into the impact of collectivisation.

Overall, the source has significant weight for an enquiry into the impacts of collectivisation because even though he is critical about the policy as we would expect, it shows the reality that collectivisation had left Russian agriculture in a state of terminal sickness and even though his purpose could have been to denounce Soviet crimes against humanity due to collectivisation, most of what he says in the source can be heavily supported by evidence so it shows he is not overemphasising the horrible impact of collectivisation on Russian agriculture and the countryside population.

This is a strong level 4 response. It draws out a range of inferences from the source material and these inferences are tested with contextual knowledge to develop the discussion on the weight of the source for the inquiry. The provenance of the source is used effectively. There is strong reasoning throughout the answer.

Question 2

This was the most popular essay question. The best answers were underpinned by a depth of knowledge on a range of relevant issues relating to the nature of the government of the USSR under Lenin and Stalin and were underpinned by an informed discussion on the extent of change. Informed responses examined the ideological principle behind communist government, considered the role of institutions such as *Sovnarkom*, and the growing importance of the authority of the leader developing into personal dictatorship served by a terror system. At the lower levels, candidates struggled to focus on the nature and government and tended to describe policies pursued by Lenin and Stalin with a focus on economic policy. Such responses provided some links to nature of government but were unable to access level four. Some candidates did not take sufficient notice of the time period set in the question and provided a survey of government from Lenin to Gorbachev. This restricted their achievement in the levels.

The nature of the USSR government between 1917 - 1953 can be mainly classified into three: Terror, bureaucracy and Personal Rule (Autocracy). Although ~~the~~ ~~was~~ the nature ^{did not change} ~~was~~ not changed, the extent of ~~terror~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~government~~, the extent of it ^{was} hugely varied ~~under~~ ~~Stalin's~~ ~~extreme~~ ~~impact~~ as Stalin hugely amplified. ~~Even~~ though the Personal Rule under Stalin might be argued as change of ~~the~~ the government's nature.

The ~~not~~ ~~of~~ Terror usage was continuous from 1917 to 1953 under Lenin as Stalin, keeping its nature. However, ~~Stalin~~ Lenin's Red Army Terrorised country, especially during the civil war. Requisitioning allowed them to forcibly take crops from peasants, ~~and~~ and the absence of justice let them hang the Kulaks without any reasons to justify. ~~Stalin~~ Lenin, however, did not use terror to the communist Party members but ^{to} the opponents. ~~Stalin~~ Stalin on the other hand, was extensive user of terror, as he used it to ~~purge~~ eliminate other party members that challenged his authority. For example, the purge of Party, including the purge of 16, 17 and 21, killed Zinoviev ~~and~~ ~~and~~ Kamenev and key ~~of~~ figures like Bukharin to get rid of ~~of~~ people who had any impacts on the party. What is more, he started to continue to expand the influence of terror by building up 'Gulag', the labour camp and send a number of innocent people. ~~Yezhovshchina~~, conducted by Yezhov, ~~the~~ who was head of Soviet police under Stalin, ~~was~~ was a massacre, killing more than 3 million and leaving unbalanced figures of one out of eight ~~of~~ people ~~of~~ arrested in whole USSR. As a result, ~~even~~ though the terrorism ~~did not~~ ~~was not~~ ~~changed~~, ~~by~~ ~~Stalin~~, the extent of ^{terror} increased dramatically under Stalin, but the nature of government, as Lenin also used terror, did not change.

Moreover, the bureaucracy in the USSR government stayed the same as supporters of Lenin and Stalin, used as a power base. Lenin could be supported in the government from the early 1917 because of the 'Abmenklatura' system, when he could appoint supporters to the party, like patronage system. Lenin's use of this bureaucracy allowed him to have authority to publish many decrees such as demand Nationalization, which helped him to control the country further. Likewise, Stalin's fundamental powerbase, even before the death of Lenin in 1924 came from his use of bureaucracy, as he was General Secretary, the more he used nomenclature, the more supporters he had. He also amplified his power by launching Lenin Enrollment and Stalin Enrollment, encouraging more and more people to join the party and become supporters of Stalin. In this way Stalin could manipulate other rivals of himself by taking their official power off from the government, like when Zinoviev and Kamenev were ~~excluded out from the two~~ lost their power. As a result of Stalin Lenin could use bureaucracy, the nature of a Soviet Government to build up their political power, which means the nature of the government stayed, but as Stalin encouraged a number of people move to the party and filled the government with his supporters it can be seen that he had better use of bureaucracy.

However, it could be argued that the personal rule nature of personal rule is changed under Stalin as Stalin removed any democracy left in the government, when Lenin was sometimes stopped by other party members, ~~but~~ Lenin's although he published 'on party's unity' banning other factions in the government, he was allowed free debate in the politburo the highest class in

the USSR, and he was ~~also~~ often stopped or disowned by other members. ~~For example,~~ when he introduced NEP, ^(New Economic Plan) many communist revolutionaries were against it, criticizing it as 'capitalist'. However, Stalin, by removing everyone who had any power or impact on the government, had full ^{authority} ~~control~~ of the country. Anyone who became popular among people was purged or assassinated. Like Kirov, ~~who was~~ Stalin's follower, when he was killed ~~and~~ he was popular in Moscow. Moreover, his cold personality brought himself as 'vozhd' & like Hitler & H特勒 in Nazi Germany, even being loved by people everywhere in the USSR. Therefore, the nature of personal rule ~~was~~ could be challenged by Stalin as he got rid of any sort of challenges or potential challenge that might face him. Nevertheless, Lenin, even though he ~~was~~ could be criticized, he was seen as the highest figure in the government and most of his ideas were passed, including controversial NEP, ~~which~~ which ~~can~~ mean that the nature of personal rule has also stayed.

To sum up, the nature of the Soviet Government had not changed under Lenin and Stalin ~~or~~ between 1917 to 1953, as ~~Lenin and Stalin~~ ~~Lenin, not terror and Chka under Lenin and Purges~~

Terror was used by both Lenin and Stalin, ~~and~~ Chka and NKVD, bureaucracy was used ~~in~~ in terms of power base in the government, and personal rule where Lenin and Stalin ~~had~~ were the most important figures in the government. However, the ^{extent of} ~~scale of~~ ~~range~~ was far further and larger under Stalin, especially in personal rule, that eliminated every form of opposition, ~~which~~ which might be argued that the nature of ~~it~~ almost changed but ~~it~~ as Lenin was also the most respected founder, it can be ~~seen~~ seen as development rather than change.

This is a strong level 4 response. It has focused analysis and developed judgements. There is a good range of knowledge that is deployed effectively. The conclusion that the nature did not change but aspects were intensified forms a compelling argument and the response achieves level 4 in all the bullet points.

Question 3

A small number of candidates answered this question. Some candidates were well informed on Brezhnev's policies to achieve a stable society and considered factors such as full employment and healthcare as well as the problem of alcohol. A number of candidates focused more on political stability and although these answers had some implicit focus on the question, they did not engage in the discussion at the highest level an achievement was therefore restricted.

Leonid Brezhnev did a number of things to create a stable society after the turbulent year of Khrushchev involving 'trust in co-ops', increased living standards. This allowed a stable society

Brezhnev was able to achieve a stable society by firstly creating a stable political system. He began the policy of restoration which reversed many of Khrushchev's disliked reforms. He reversed the decentralisation of the party ~~by~~ by ~~restoring~~ returning the power back to the Gosplan, the main body for planning what goods have to be produced in a year. Further the sovnarkhozs were dismantled and power returned back to the all-Union Ministries which greatly decreased the nervousity of the party bureaucrats as they ~~now~~ were used to be responsible for things they could not control properly. Also the hated fixed terms were abolished

allowing officials to stay in their positions as long as they wished which increased Brezhnev's popularity and restored trust in the leadership. Furthermore, he introduced the 'Trust in cadres' which meant that the control and supervision of the party officials were greatly reduced and the officials were mostly left to their own devices allowing them to work with less bureaucracy, ~~as to~~ Brezhnev stabilised society in 1964-82 by ~~the~~ achieving a stable political system which allowed Brezhnev to concentrate on society more and quench any needs they had.

~~But~~ Under Brezhnev, the Soviet population experienced an ~~massive~~ increase in living standards. ~~Because~~ This was due to the construction and replacement of 'khrushchyovskas' which were prefabricated blocks which could be quickly assembled. Brezhnev also built communal blocks for the population which led to a 35% growth of cities throughout Russia. Further medical facilities quality was improved and the availability of medicine was increased. Brezhnev further subsidised rent, water, electricity, social welfare and health care for everyone.

Also the people saw an increase in wages of 15% as Brezhnev ~~was~~ adjusted both real wages and net wages.

~~However, by Brezhnev implementing many stability policies, it led to stagnation.~~

Even though Brezhnev stabilized the Soviet Society with his policies, many led to stagnation as well. The unlimited terms of people in positions meant that many officials would stay in their positions which stifled any creativity. Coupled with the 'trust in cadres' policy many of these officials became corrupt as they opted to make more money from their dead-end job rather than grow socialism.

Furthermore, Brezhnev declared that Russia was now in the stage of 'developed socialism' and ~~therefore~~ stopped encouraging a revolutionary spirit which led to more corruption and less unity, which was vital for the USSR.

Instead Brezhnev would focus on helping other countries to achieve a 'permanent revolution' in Zimbabwe, Mexico and Vietnam.

Moreover, Brezhnev's policy of unlimited terms and 'trust in cadres' raised the ~~living~~ age of party

considerably as no new people could join due to no promotions nor sackings. This led to more stagnation in the political system as it now was a gerontocracy, a rule of old men, which often refused to change or reform.

Society also

Society also saw major issues during Brezhnev's rule. The increase wages increased demand for goods which state shops could not provide.

Many Because of this lack of variety and a lot of money many Soviet men began to buy cheap vodka in state shops leading to a soaring alcoholism rate, with 20 million alcoholics by 1982.

This caused had consequences on both society and economy. The men would often abuse their wives leading to an increase of domestic violence and divorce rates.

The economy suffered under these conditions as well.

The high alcoholism rate in Soviet states led many men exercising absenteeism as they were either drunk or hungover and incapable of work. This led to the economic growth shrink from 7% in 1959 to 3.3% in 1975. The stagnation of political politics

and society were had major consequences of on the economy. The stagnation and aging of the politicians caused much needed reforms like the Liberman and Kosygin reforms to be watered down and to ineffectiveness. Also the old managers of factories still held on to 'quantity over quality' and refused to use old new machines as time would be lost in installing, training and retooling production. This led to ~~major~~ mostly shoddy quality goods which were ^{sometimes} completely unusable.

~~Moreover, many factories~~ This coupled with the increasing corruption led to a thriving black market which supplied Soviet citizens with the things that the state shops could not.

Brezhnev called it the 'second economy' and allowed it due to the 'social contract' between the citizens and the government which said that as long as the government provided for citizens, the citizens would comply.

Although Brezhnev did create a stable society in which 1/9 people had a car and many now had proper apartments, many of his policies perpetuated the stagnation plaguing both society, economy and politics. The stagnation can however not be pinpointed on Brezhnev alone, he inherited a system

was doomed to fail, to an extent, due to the rigid structure of a command economy and the unwillingness of many to allow change stilted much needed progress.

This is a low level 4 response. There is some analysis and attempt to explain the links to the question. However, in places it tends to wander into discussing political stability rather than the stable society. Therefore, it enters level 4 but does not reach the higher marks within the level.

Question 4

A small number of candidates answered this question. Most candidates scored in mid to high level three and into level 4. Candidates were well-informed on a range of economic problems that confronted the Soviet economy in the period 1964-85, although in several answers there was limited reference to military spending and this did impact on the analysis and development of the judgement in responses.

The main reason for the weaknesses of the Soviet economy in the years 1964-1985 was the priority given to spending on the military but only to an extent.

Firstly, Brezhnev was the General Secretary during the period 1964-1982 and in 1985 Mikhail Gorbachev took over his seat. Brezhnev led ^{the USSR} to a stagnation in the economy not only by spending too much money on the military to compete with the western powers to fight in the Cold War but also because of his social & political policies which made the workforce unable to produce goods and services for example. Brezhnev spent 25% of ~~the~~ USSR's GDP into the military. This is a significant amount of money. The USSR wanted to keep up with the western powers and invested a lot of money into technology. Moreover, they also invested money on missiles which were stationed in Cuba so that they were closer to the USA. This was during the Cold War where a lot of tension existed between the USA and the USSR. While the USA had positioned missiles in Turkey, Russia had them in Cuba. Brezhnev's aim was to keep up with the technology weaponry in the western countries. They also invested money into the Russian Air Force, Navy, and the space programme where they were successful because they were the first nation who accomplished a trip to the moon. There was a constant rivalry between the USA and the USSR and

each country invested millions into the military to be better than the other.

Secondly, another reason for the weakness of the Soviet economy in the years 1964-1985 ~~was~~ ^{were} the social/^{political} policies of Brezhnev.

Brezhnev's ~~stagnation~~ stagnation in the society was enormous. Although he increased the minimum and the real wage by 50% the people could not do a lot with that money because the ~~less~~ goods and services were missing due to the weak economy. People enjoyed higher living standards. However, prices of some goods were too high (water was more expensive than vodka). Therefore a lot of Russian bought vodka instead of water and the USSR faced the problem of alcoholism. Due that a lot of the workforce was unable to work and there was the famous work off monday. Workers were so drunk that they didn't go to work on mondays. Additionally, the USSR had the highest divorce rate in Europe. 50% of all marriages in Moscow ended up in a divorce. This led to a lot of single people who were devastated and were in debt. Moreover, single living people are spending less money than married people which decreased consumption in the USSR. Politically, Brezhnev kept his secretaries such as Chernenko for nearly 18 years. A lot of the politicians during Brezhnev's time as General Secretary were 60+, 70+. This led to no new reforms because they were enjoying their political status but with no new policies the workers got unmotivated and had no pressure ~~to~~ to get to work. However, in 1977 the new Soviet Constitution was put in order which created the norm 5 day work week.

Moreover, the next reason for the weakness of the Soviet economy in the years 1964-1985 was the spending on imports, and the decline in economic growth due to no investment. Although the Russians found oil in Siberia in the mid 1970s, they could not improve their economy. Back then the discovery of oil was one of the main aims for big powers such as the USSR. However, instead of investing the money from the oil into their economy by spending it on their infrastructure for example, they had to spend their money on exports. They needed resources such as grain from Australia so that the civilians could survive. Their economic growth rate declined from 7% in 1964 to merely 3% in 1982. This was due to Brezhnev. Although people had a high living standard and every 9th household had a car, nearly every home had a television and a radio, there were no new economical policies since the 5 year plans. This leads back to the old politicians which had no inspiration to create new policies, the USSR would have needed young, fresh politicians who were willing to change something. However, Brezhnev had new plans on improving the economy, especially in the manufacturing sector. He had worked out new technology and wanted to train the workers so that they would get more skilled but since the workers were drunk and often uneducated, they could not learn the new skills and therefore the new improvements were denounced and the workers kept on working the old fashioned way.

Overall, the main reason for the weakness of the Soviet economy was the priority given to spending on the military, but only to an extent. There were also Brezhnev's political and social policies which led to a stagnation of the economy. The spending on exports is another factor. Without a doubt, Brezhnev was an intelligent General Secretary but in the end he was too old to come up with new policies and a bit egoistic because he wanted to remain General Secretary.

This is a mid-level 3 response. Its focus does vary but there is a good section that describes a range of relevant economic problems including stagnation and poor investment as well as making some reference to military spending. There is some inaccuracy and descriptive material on soviet society that has little relevance here. It achieves in level three with weak focus on the given factor but other relevant material.

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

Section A

- Make sure you are aware of the topics highlighted for the source question and have prepared for them
- A careful reading of the sources is needed so that the issues raised are clearly identified
- You must ensure that you draw out inferences, but these should always be directly linked to the source and not driven by contextual knowledge
- You should consider the nature, origin and purpose of the source
- Do not merely restate what the provenance says – think about how it can be used to address the question. In a, this requires a consideration of how it adds value and in b, this requires considering value and limitations
- Do not deal with the ‘bullet points’ separately – value and weight are established by a more holistic approach that uses context and consideration of provenance to evaluate the source
- Contextual knowledge should be used to support the answer, not to drive it, and should be made relevant to the enquiry
- Question 1a does not require a consideration of the limitations of sources
- It is unlikely that weight can be assessed by listing all the things that a source does not deal with.

Section B

- Spending a few minutes planning helps to ensure the second order concept is correctly identified
- Candidates must provide more precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses lacked depth and sometimes range
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Essay questions are set over a period of at least ten years; candidates need to address the whole time period set in the question
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues in order to make the structure of the response flow more logically and to enable the integration of analysis.

