



Pearson

Examiners' Report

June 2017

GCE History 8HI0 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 2017

Publications Code 8HI0_1E_1706_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this, the second year of the reformed AS Level Paper 1 Option 1E: Russia, 1917-91: from Lenin to Yeltsin.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting the second order concepts of cause and/or consequence. Section B offers a further choice of essays, targeting any of 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. Examiners did note a number of scripts that posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

Of the three sections of Paper 1, 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 that was being targeted by the question. A minority of candidates, often otherwise knowledgeable, 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. Candidates in the main 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 greater depth of knowledge required where Section A questions targeted a shorter-period, as compared to the more careful selection generally required for the Section B questions covering a broader timespan.

Candidates do need to formulate their planning so that there is an argument and a counter argument 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, exploring the validity of the arguments offered by the two historians in the light of the evidence, both from within the extracts, and candidates' own contextual knowledge. Such responses tended to avoid attempts to examine the extracts in a manner more suited to AO2, assertions of the inferiority of an extract on the basis of it offering less factual evidence, or a drift away from the specific demands of the question to the wider taught topic.

Question 1

On Question 1, stronger responses targeted the reasons for the establishment of Bolshevik control over the USSR in the years 1917-28 and included an analysis of links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (causation). Sufficient knowledge was used to develop the stated factor (use of terror) and a range of other factors (e.g. control of the press and radio, use of the arts and culture, and pragmatic concessions such as the NEP). Judgements made about the relative importance of the use of terror 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 reasons for the establishment of Bolshevik control over the USSR in the years 1917-28. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on causation or were essentially a narrative of the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far (e.g. one aspect of the stated factor such as the Cheka). Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

SECTION A

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

Chosen question number: **Question 1** **Question 2**

The use of terror between 1917-1928 used by the Bolshevik regime to seize control over the USSR may^{not} be the only reason due to how Lenin dealt with things when he didn't get what he wanted such as, when elections happened in 1921 and didn't go to Plan he banned them making Russia a one party state to stay in power and gain control, however others may argue that other reasons such as terror was a the way to gain control over the USSR.

Between the years 1917-1928, Lenin being in power meant he had total control and by doing this he used terror as an advantage to gain it. ^{by using the Bolsheviks} He used violence, ~~but not as often~~, he executed some Party leaders and used ~~the~~ ^{also known as the Cheka} the Secret Police to spy on people. The Secret Police didn't wear a uniform to make it easier to blend in and listen to conversations if you was

(Section A continued) disagreeing or going against Lenin. The Bolshevik regime started from 300,000 members and incredibly increased between the years as this could be seen as ~~the~~ ^{the} Bolsheviks gaining control over the USSR. However the Bolsheviks ~~did~~ didn't seize total control over the USSR as there was a break out of sailors who went against Lenin in 1926.

Furthermore, the Bolsheviks did have an impact on ~~control~~ the USSR by using terror but other ways ~~was~~ was used to gain control. Other ways of gaining control over the USSR was the Nomenkultura system. This was a list of people in the party and if you wasn't on it you wouldn't for example be promoted. This led to control over the USSR as everyone would want to be on the list to help provide a better life for their families and life would be seen easier.

In conclusion, terror did have a great impact on gaining control over the USSR by making people live in fear of going against the regime but other reasons such as the Nomenkultura system helped gain ~~the~~ control over the USSR in the years 1917-24.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 2 response exhibits many of the shortcomings of lower scoring answers: (1) it offers limited analysis of the reasons why the Bolshevik regime was able to establish its control over the USSR in the years 1917-28, (2) the candidate's own knowledge lacks range and depth (e.g. little is offered on the use of terror or other methods), (3) although there is some focus on causation some sections are essentially descriptive, and (4) an overall judgement is given but because of the limitations noted above it lacks proper substantiation.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

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

Question 2

On Question 2, stronger responses targeted the reasons for the economic difficulties faced by the Soviet Union in the years 1929-41 and included an analysis of links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (causation). Sufficient knowledge was used to develop the stated factor (failures of collectivisation) and a range of other factors (e.g. the problems associated with the Five Year Plans and the economic impact of the purges of the 1930s). Judgements made about the relative importance of the failures of collectivisation were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. There was also a fair depth of knowledge applied to analysis. Judgements in the main were reasoned and thus considered criteria. The answers were clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a limited analysis of the reasons for the Soviet Union's economic difficulties in the years 1929-41. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on causation or were essentially a narrative of the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far (e.g. one aspect of the stated factor such as the liquidation of the kulaks). Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

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

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2

Plan:

<u>Collectivisation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• conflicts over merges• less productive agriculturally as a result. 76 → 68M tonnes of grain• 100M animals destroyed in protest.	<u>Gosplan targets</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• over ambitious → targets unrealistic• managers lied about production• lack of developed transport systems
military spending corruption Corruption	Technology - investment in heavy industry through 5yr plans

Throughout Stalins reign, difficulties and failures caused by collectivisation of farming and agriculture led the Soviet Union to fall into economic difficulty. There were however other factors that influenced the Soviet Unions economic troubles, such as the unrealistic targets set by Gosplan as well as lack of sufficient technology to productively ^{produce} goods to supply the country. I will weigh up these factors throughout this essay, and believe that although collectivisation

was a major factor, ~~and~~ was not the only big issue damaging the economy.

Stalin's decision to collectivise private farms into larger farms brought about significant upset throughout the Soviet Union, which had a detrimental effect on ~~the~~ ^{economic} output.

Peasants were upset that their freely running businesses were no longer under their control, as it meant they no longer individually benefited from the rewards of the ~~products~~ ^{goods} produced. Instead, they were expected to work on behalf of the Soviet, and received rations. The lack of freedoms

(Section A continued) imposed on peasants meant they lacked motivation. ~~and~~ No measures were in place to incentivise workers, and lack of co-operation between families who did not want to conform to the Communist ideology led to a decrease in agricultural output. Grain procurement on farms fell massively from 76 million tons in 1938 to 68 million in 1941. As a result the government had to reduce the size of rations which not only ~~exposed~~ ^{exposed} the failure to industrialise and expand economic growth but also meant that working conditions and faith in the government continued to decrease. Peasants ~~also~~ ^{were} recorded to have destroyed approximately 100 million cattle, ~~horses~~ ^{horses} and sheep in an attempt of rebellion, which also led to economic instability ~~for~~ ^{for} the government, who had originally predicted the move of collectivisation to be a success. Collectivisation is therefore a major factor influencing the economic problems faced by the Soviet government.

Economic difficulty was however influenced by other factors besides collectivisation. Centralisation of economic planning through the introduction of Gosplan as well as narrow priorities in the Five-Year Plans also led to economic instability. ~~As a~~ ^Pplanning was no longer undertaken by factory managers & owners themselves, Gosplan ^{took over and proved} ~~proved~~ to be inefficient at doing so. Incorrect orders e.g. type or quantities of steel led to chaos, as factories were put on hold waiting for decisions made by Gosplan to be implemented.

~~Gosplan also set production~~ Inefficient or broken machinery

(Section A continued) that needed replacing never actually got replaced, due to lack of co-ordination. Gosplan also set production levels which were strictly implemented throughout the Union. Managers had to lie about reached targets to avoid punishment, and were forced to push workers to the max, producing as many items as possible, disregarding the quality. As a result, over 40% of produced steel went to waste due to the quality produced being too bad to use. This wasn't helped by the lack of developed transport systems, which along with Gosplan failed to successfully transport goods around the country. This was partly due to lack of technological focus through the first ~~&~~ Five Year Plans, which really limited the true capabilities of the country. ~~As a result~~ ^{The five-year} Plans also failed to focus on consumer and light goods, which led to shortages and rising prices which simply could not be

afforded by hard working peasants, who continued to get nothing back from the Communist Party. Therefore, due to a lack of planning and stability in relation to economic growth, the Soviet Union was very inefficient, ~~and~~ which heavily contributed to the economic difficulties faced.

There were other economic issues faced by the Soviet Union. Over a third of government spending went to military developments, which were ~~to~~^{used} to fight the Cold War, as well as preparing the country for potential war with

(Section A continued) capitalist countries. Centralisation of ~~the~~^{economic} planning also led to politicians and senior members of the party exploiting the system. It gave them the opportunity to experiment through trial & error, which meant that the stability of the economy was affected. Investing almost 90% of funds on heavy industry exposed Stalin's need to do big things (which was also seen through his obsession for large factories & huge aeroplanes). It meant that other industries greatly suffered and it affected the balance between them, as shown through the scissor crisis which led to consumer goods being too expensive to afford altogether. Therefore, due to the personal ambitions and target set by Stalin, without the due planning beforehand, economic troubles continued to slow the rate of industrialisation and development in the Soviet Union.

To conclude, Collectivisation was a major factor which brought about instability and economic trouble, however it was the lack of initial planning and ~~the~~ ^{clear} direction by the Soviet government and Gosplan that ultimately led to economic trouble. Perhaps if planning wasn't so centralised, those with the most experience in their own area of industry would have been best equipt to deal with industrialising the country, and improving economic stability instead ~~as~~ of decreasing it.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 4 response possesses several strengths, namely: (1) it targets the reasons for the Soviet Union's economic difficulties in the years 1929-41 and has a good focus on the stated factor - the failures of collectivisation, (2) sufficient own knowledge is brought in to assess the stated factor (e.g. lack of incentives, falling output, destruction of livestock) and other factors (centralisation of economic planning, skewed economic development favouring heavy industry and the military), and (3) a reasoned judgement is reached in the conclusion based on the criteria developed in the analysis.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Higher level responses tend to offer clear reasoning and justification based on 'consideration of criteria'. This need not be laboriously laid out in generic terms. In this question, candidates justified 'main reason' in terms such as the impact the factor had on the industrialisation drive, economic efficiency and output.

Question 3

On Question 3, stronger responses targeted how far government control over Soviet culture was maintained in the years 1953-85. 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. the Brezhnev regime implemented a cultural clampdown, Andropov continued to control popular culture, Khrushchev's de-Stalinisation policy loosened Soviet control, and the development of a western-influenced Soviet youth culture by the late 1950s). Judgements made about the extent of change and continuity regarding government control over Soviet 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, at best, offered a limited analysis of the extent to which government control over Soviet culture was maintained in the years 1953-85. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on change/continuity or were essentially a description of Soviet culture during the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (e.g. narrowly focusing on the official restrictions faced by artists under Khrushchev). Furthermore, such responses were often 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 3 Question 4

Government control over the years 1953-85 was very High. Throughout the years 1953-64 Khrushchev was in Power and helped the Peasants ^{by using} ~~with~~ his virgin land schemes. Khrushchev helped with agriculture as he saw himself as ^{'one'} ~~a farmer~~ as he ~~was~~ was brought up with a low background.

Other reasons as to why the Government had a variety amount of control was due to they controlled what went in the newspapers. 'Pravda' been Russia's popular newspaper was told what to ~~write~~^{write}, even if it wasn't true but not all writers agreed with this and didn't do it but as a consequence they were either killed, executed or sent to the Gulags.

Libraries were also purged, so nobody could get any capitalist ideas as the Government were ~~the~~ trying to spread communism throughout Russia.

Governments also seized control through culture by choosing films that went into the theatres.

Movies that glorified the regime and showed hatred towards there enemy would be showed to spread communism.

Social development, meaning society understood the values of the revolution, meaning the ~~rev~~ values of the revolution carried on throughout the years and people developed it naturally.

In conclusion, the Government had limited control over the culture as people still went against what they wanted even if they were controlling by telling people what to write.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This Level 1 response exhibits many of the shortcomings of lower scoring answers: (1) it makes a few generalised statements about government control over Soviet culture without really engaging with the issue of how far such control was maintained in the years 1953-85, (2) it lacks range and depth and offers a basic asserted judgement at the end, and (3) there is little attempt to structure the answer appropriately.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Higher level responses are often based on brief plans that offer a logical structure for the analysis. They identify three or four themes and points for and against the proposition. Take a minute or two at the beginning to plan before you start writing your response. That way, you are more likely to produce a relevant, logical and well-structured response.

Question 4

On Question 4, stronger responses targeted the view that the most significant Soviet social development in the years 1924-85 was the provision of social security. These included an analysis of the links between key issues and a focus on the concept (significance) in the question. In addition, sufficient knowledge was used to assess the significance of the provision of social security (e.g. the impact of high employment levels and expanding housing, social benefit and healthcare provision) set against a range of other Soviet social developments (e.g. growth of education and literacy, improved status of women, limitations of social security provision). Judgements made about the relative significance of social security provision 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 view that the provision of social security was the most significant Soviet social development in the years 1924-85. Lower scoring answers also often lacked focus on significance or were essentially a description of social developments in the Soviet Union during these years. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it lacked range/depth (e.g. limited comments on Soviet employment levels or housing provision). Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

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

Chosen question number: **Question 3** **Question 4**

From the years, 1924 to 1985, the USSR occupied numerous leaders with numerous aims. The social standing of the USSR was suffering in pre-revolutionary times and all, Stalin, Khrushchev and Brezhnev attempted to change that, ~~by~~ by attempts to improve provision of social security, improving levels of education and ~~improving~~ developing women's social ~~the~~ situation. Although historians argue that provision of social security was the most significant Soviet social development, it has to be seen that education is the most significant development.

Provision of social security had both successes and failures ~~worked~~ throughout the entire period of 1924 - 85. During Stalin's rule from 1928 - 1953, social security was mostly a failure due to the ~~several days~~ poor working conditions and low pay in order to succeed in the five year plans. The workers were earning low wages to meet Stalin's excessive quotas in extremely long hours. This lowered productivity and therefore influenced the whole

(Section B continued) of the USSR as production of both iron, steel and coal were low quality, as well as consumer goods. However this was not a long term issue for Stalin as during the 2nd five year plan, the production of consumer goods doubled. Under Khrushchev's rule, social security ~~was~~ must also be seen as a failure due to the poor housing conditions. ~~He~~ Many homes under Khrushchev's rule were recalled as Khrushchev slums as the state of them was horrendous. Homes holding families had no tap ~~or~~ running tap water and family living space was reduced to just 4 ~~sq~~ sqm. ~~Furthermore,~~ Alternatively, healthcare was improving as by this point ^{due to Stalin}, also vaccinations for small pox were available, the number of doctors had doubled and medici-

nes were cheaper.* Provision of social security under Brezhnev also wasn't very significant as not a lot had improved, although ~~the~~ Brezhnev did help the poorer citizens by introducing a way of subsidising rent. ~~the~~ Furthermore, Khrushchev doubled the amount of housing ~~with~~ in urban areas. ~~How~~ None the less, ~~the~~ provision of social security was not the most significant soviet social development as housing was not consistent or improving and (Section B continued) living standards remained poor.

Education was the most significant social development as it made the most progress and benefited a wide scale amount of people. Under Stalin's control, education was becoming more equal and beneficial. Stalin introduced CORE subjects such as maths and science to ~~base~~ form the basis of an education. This was significant as it brought about more equality. ~~the~~ ~~Further~~ ~~more,~~ ~~Stalin~~ ~~taught~~ ~~about~~ Some historians may argue that Stalin's ~~was~~ ~~an~~ educational development was insignificant and unequal as only 1 pencil was accessible for 60 students and only 88% of peasants could read ~~and~~ compared to 94% of urban areas. However, ~~the~~ all students were still showing a massive improvement and

are evidently achieving. This showed a successful and significant ~~development~~ social development.

Khrushchev's educational development was extremely significant in ~~equal~~ reintroducing equal chances due to the abolishment of tuition fees, 1961, ~~the~~ as well as the ~~decreation~~ ~~of special~~ establishment of special funds for the poorest, which both gave more opportunities for students despite their ~~original~~ deprived social security. However it could be argued that this is unequal

(Section B continued) due to the education law introduced by Khrushchev allowing more talented students, more experienced teaching, reducing the level of equality. Brezhnev's educational development is also more significant as he made universities more accessible to all and ensured that 70% of teachers went to universities themselves. Brezhnev also allowed text books to be free of charge which again narrows a gap of inequality.

The social development of women was less significant than the provision of social security due to the fact social security included a lot of influencing, ~~fact~~ significant factors that helped women, such as legalisation of abortion under Khrushchev. Furthermore, under Brezhnev, he

introduced a family code in 1968 which allowed women to have more support.

To conclude, education must be seen as the most significant Soviet social development as it had a huge scale impact and allowed more intelligent and education to be reproduced and reproduce more skilled workers, through polytechnic education. Although social provision of social security can be seen as most significant in these times, it must be considered

(Section B continued) that there was very little progress or development and therefore little ~~was~~ significance in terms of social development in the USSR.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This low Level 3 response offers: (1) some analysis of the significance of Soviet social security provision in the years 1924-85, (2) mostly accurate own knowledge is brought in to assess the relative significance of social security provision and other factors (e.g. the development of education), and (3) the criteria for judgement are mostly implicit but a conclusion on 'most significant' is reached at the end.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

When planning your answer to support/ challenge a 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 5

On Question 5, stronger responses were clearly focused on the extracts, and possessed the confidence and understanding to develop an extract-based analysis of how far the Soviet Union collapsed because of the USSR's economic weaknesses. Higher scoring answers offered some comparative analysis of the two extracts, and used own knowledge effectively to examine the merits/validity of the views presented. Stronger responses were also focused on the precise question (the role played by the USSR's economic weaknesses), rather than the general issue of the fall of the Soviet Union, and put forward a reasoned judgement on the given issue, referencing the views in the extracts.

Weaker answers tended to show some understanding of the extracts and attempted to focus on how far the Soviet Union collapsed because of Gorbachev's failure to deal with the challenge of nationalism. Such responses, however, demonstrated limited development by relying on a basic 'economy versus nationalism' approach. At the lower levels, basic points were selected from the extracts for illustration and comparisons made between the two extracts were fairly rudimentary. Less able candidates sometimes also relied almost exclusively on the extracts as sources of information about the USSR's economic weaknesses and/or other factors. Others made limited use of the two extracts and attempted to answer the question relying largely on their own knowledge. Moreover, in lower scoring responses, the candidate's own knowledge tended to be illustrative (e.g. just tacked on to points from the extracts) or drifted from the main focus of the question. Furthermore, these answers were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.

- 5 Historians have different views about the reasons for the fall of the Soviet Union. Analyse and evaluate the extracts and use your knowledge of the issues to explain your answer to the following question.

How far do you agree with the view that the collapse of the Soviet Union came about because of the USSR's economic weaknesses?

(20)

The USSR unravelled in 1991, and since then historians have tried to find key reasons why ~~there~~ such an unpredictable and wholesale change occurred. Source 1 focuses on Gorbachev's economic and political reforms were the key reason for his downfall, along with the USSR. Darwin, in extract two however offers an alternative viewpoint to Evans, he focuses on the 'Eastern European revolt' as the main reason for the collapse of the USSR. Both sources suggest that Gorbachev is the main reason for the collapse of the Soviet Union, as in source one it is evident through

"Gorbachev's failure to stimulate the country's sluggish economy" whilst in
Barwin suggest that Gorbachev took "a big risk", and "might even prove
fatal".

Evans suggests that the ~~main reason~~ Gorbachev's economic
and political reforms which were interlinked is the main explanation for the
collapse of the Soviet Union. Evans suggests that it was Gorbachev
who failed to "stimulate the country's sluggish economy, This
statement is referring to the fact that when Gorbachev became general
secretary of the Party in 1985 he issued a series of measures to improve
production and economic growth ~~and~~ or launched a series of

(Section C continued) uncoordinated policies such as acceleration, once these
failed he experimented with further policies such as perestroika
which gave the process an air of controlled planning that did not
exist. Evans also mentions that this resulted in an ~~accelerated~~
a "rapid decline in his popularity" which ~~was~~ and such statement is
of significant validity and weight. For the more radical reformers
e.g. Yeltsin there was an increasing realization that Gorbachev was
not going to pursue the reforms most they felt were needed. Division
between the more radical reformers and conservatives were evident within
the party which undermined the authority of Gorbachev. This led to
a development of factions within the party. ~~He~~ suggests the source
and Evans suggests that economic weakness combined with party
resulted in the collapse of the USSR. He also suggests that the
aims of "~~perestroika~~" "glasnost and perestroika" ^{were} not being
achieved". This view is of significant weight and accuracy as

the Soviet government fell back on the traditional Soviet method of increasing investment controlled by central planner to increase ~~growth~~ production with the hope it would increase growth within the economy. This was to be implemented by the ~~the~~ twelve 5 year plan although like Soviet planning before it it contained key weaknesses as investment was heavily skewed towards construction projects which had a habit of leading to over-spends. This view further suggests that economic weakness was the main cause and explanation for the collapse of the Soviet Union. ~~The~~ Evans view also highlights that party control was also linked to economic weakness as the reforms were only viewed as significant

(Section C continued) 'cosmetic'. This statement holds ~~the~~ weight as

one example of this is the setting up of ^{economic} superministries.

These reforms had little impact ~~as~~ the chief obstacle being they were implemented by those whose principal positions the reforms were trying to reduce. This led to the development of 60,000 opposition groups who held meetings, organised demonstrations and added their voice to a growing call for reform. Evans suggests that shortages and "long queues for basic necessities" led to a rapid decline in the quality of life of the Russian people is always the most significant factor that resulted in the collapse of the USSR ~~as~~ ~~caused~~. Caused by economic weakness through the policy of co-operatives being legalised and law on state enterprises, food production was inefficient to feed the growing needs of the Soviet population, as uncertainty over food supplies led to shops being rickety and food supplies with rationing being introduced in ~~the~~ 26 out of the 55 regions in the USSR.

Darwin, however, unlike Evans, suggests that the national question was the main reason for the collapse of the USSR. He claims that due to the abandonment of the Brezhnev doctrine East Europe reformed into an "Eastern Europe revolt." In ~~Poland~~^{Czechoslovakia} for example ~~the~~ the government was forced into concessions due to growing reform in the streets. Civic was engaged to co-ordinate the removal of the communist party. Under some pressure the communist's caved in and reforms were introduced, which as Darwin suggests proved "fatal". Other examples of nationalist revolt

(Section C continued) is East Germany which he once pays attention to as correctly he once states in "1989 the Berlin wall came down" partly due to "people power". However, Darwin's view that these events debilitated the "legitimacy of the Soviet regime" is unfair. The nationalist movement was stopped by the large number of ethnic people not living in their home lands - 60 million Russians lived in other areas of the Soviet Union. A referendum held in 1991 indicated popular support for the Soviet regime, and this was without ~~the~~ ~~collapse~~ East Germany, and the Baltic republics it did not mean the collapse of the legitimacy of the Soviet regime. Although neither Gower, mentions heavily in detail about the role of Yeltsin and other reformers who persuaded Gorbachev into reform. Yeltsin encouraged reform, in return he visited check leaders, striking mines and organised meetings that this was Gorbachev's ~~error~~ supports in defence of Gorbachev. The fall in the world's oil prices meant economic reform was carried out in a highly unfavourable situation ~~also~~ which Evans fails to suggest. He also does not mention that US star wars

policy put pressure on the USSR to divert much needed resources away from the production of consumer goods and social welfare programmes, or the fact that he had limited understanding of Economic matters. Darwin fails to mention that the ending of the Khrushchev doctrine and the rapid collapse of the communist ~~or~~ governments was unexpected, as the aim was for the countries to reform and become regimes of popular support. Therefore without the added factor ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~collapse~~, in defence of Gorbachev, undermining Darwin's ~~point~~ alternative interpretation further, and thus carries limited weight, ~~as~~

(Section C continued) Compared to Evans interpretation.

To conclude the rapid collapse of the Soviet government was caused by numerous factors that were interlinked, but in this case, Evans' interpretation holds far more significant weight than Darwin. The source explains that economic weakness was the most important ^{factor} for the collapse of the ~~USSR~~ Soviet Union, and ~~that~~ explains 'in detail' with accuracy and his opinions are of high validity. Therefore economic weakness was the main reason for the collapse of the ~~the~~ Soviet Union.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This Level 4 response possesses several obvious strengths, namely: (1) it offers a clear understanding of the extracts and uses this to develop an analysis of the competing views provided by Evans/Jenkins and Darwin, (2) it uses own knowledge effectively to examine the strengths and weaknesses of these views, (3) it is focused on the precise issue (the USSR's economic weaknesses) rather than the general controversy concerning the collapse of the Soviet Union, and (4) it offers a reasoned judgement on the given issue, which references the views discussed in the extracts.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Good responses often use the introduction to set up the debate, by identifying the main arguments offered by the two interpretations. This is then followed by an exploration of these arguments in the main analysis.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on Paper 1 Option 1E, candidates are offered the following advice:

Section A/B responses

Features commonly found in candidates' responses which were successful within the higher levels were:

- Candidates paying close attention to the date ranges in the question.
- Sufficient consideration given to the issue in the question (e.g. main factor), as well as some other factors.
- Explaining their judgements fully – this need not be in an artificial or abstract way, but rather a demonstration of their reasoning in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about in order to justify their judgements.
- A careful focus on the second-order concept targeted in the question.
- Giving consideration to timing, to enable them to complete all three questions with approximately the same time given over to each one.
- An appropriate level, in terms of depth of detail and analysis, as required by the question – e.g. a realistic amount to enable a balanced and rounded answer on breadth questions.

Common issues which hindered performance were:

- Paying little heed to the precise demands of the question, e.g. writing about the topic without focusing on the question, or attempting to give an answer to a question that hasn't been asked – most frequently, this meant treating questions which targeted other second-order concepts as causation questions.
- Answering a question without giving sufficient consideration to the given issue in the question (e.g. looking at other causes, consequences, etc., with only limited reference to that given in the question).
- Answers which only gave a partial response, e.g. a very limited span of the date range, or covered the stated cause/consequence, with no real consideration of other issues.
- Assertion of change/causation, sometimes with formulaic repetition of the words of the question, with limited explanation or analysis of how exactly this was a change/cause of the issue within the question.
- A judgement was not reached, or not explained.
- A lack of detail.

Section C responses

Features commonly found in candidates' responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Candidates paying close attention to the precise demands of the question, as opposed to seemingly pre-prepared material covering the more general controversy as outlined in the specification.
- Thorough use of the extracts; this need not mean using every point they raise, but a strong focus on these as views on the question.
- A confident attempt to use the two extracts together, e.g. consideration of their differences, attempts to compare their arguments, or evaluate their relative merits.
- Careful use of own knowledge, e.g. clearly selected to relate to the issues raised within the sources, confidently using this to examine the arguments made, and reason through these in relation to the given question; at times, this meant selection over sheer amount of knowledge.
- Careful reading of the extracts, to ensure the meaning of individual statements and evidence within these were used in the context of the broader arguments made by the authors.
- Attempts to see beyond the stark differences between sources, e.g. consideration of the extent to which they disagreed, or attempts to reconcile their arguments.

Common issues which hindered performance on Section C were:

- Limited use of the extracts, or an imbalance in this, e.g. extensive use of one, with limited consideration of the other.
- Limited comparison or consideration of the differences between the given interpretations.
- Using the extracts merely as sources of support.
- Arguing one extract is superior to the other on the basis that it offers more factual evidence to back up the claims made, without genuinely analysing the arguments offered.
- Heavy use of own knowledge, or even seemingly pre-prepared arguments, without real consideration of these related to the arguments in the sources.
- Statements or evidence from the source being used in a manner contrary to that given in the sources, e.g. through misinterpretation of the meaning of the arguments, or lifting of detail without thought to the context of how it was applied within the extract.
- A tendency to see the extracts as being polar opposites, again seemingly through expectation of this, without thought to where there may be degrees of difference, or even common ground.

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>

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

