



Pearson

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2017

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level
In History (WHI02)

Paper 2: Breadth Study with Source Evaluation

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

Edexcel, BTEC and LCCI qualifications

Edexcel, BTEC and LCCI qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body offering academic and vocational qualifications that are globally recognised and benchmarked. For further information, please visit our qualification websites at www.edexcel.com, www.btec.co.uk or www.lcci.org.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus

About Pearson

Pearson is the world's leading learning company, with 40,000 employees in more than 70 countries working to help people of all ages to make measurable progress in their lives through learning. We put the learner at the centre of everything we do, because wherever learning flourishes, so do people. Find out more about how we can help you and your learners at: www.pearson.com/uk

January 2017

Publication Code WHI02_1C_1701_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

General marking guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the last candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the first.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed-out work should be marked **unless** the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

How to award marks

Finding the right level

The first stage is to decide which level the answer should be placed in. To do this, use a 'best-fit' approach, deciding which level most closely describes the quality of the answer. Answers can display characteristics from more than one level, and where this happens markers must use their professional judgement to decide which level is most appropriate.

Placing a mark within a level

After a level has been decided on, the next stage is to decide on the mark within the level. The instructions below tell you how to reward responses within a level. However, where a level has specific guidance about how to place an answer within a level, always follow that guidance.

Markers should be prepared to use the full range of marks available in a level and not restrict marks to the middle. Markers should start at the middle of the level (or the upper-middle mark if there is an even number of marks) and then move the mark up or down to find the best mark. To do this, they should take into account how far the answer meets the requirements of the level:

- If it meets the requirements *fully*, markers should be prepared to award full marks within the level. The top mark in the level is used for answers that are as good as can realistically be expected within that level
- If it only *barely* meets the requirements of the level, markers should consider awarding marks at the bottom of the level. The bottom mark in the level is used for answers that are the weakest that can be expected within that level
- The middle marks of the level are used for answers that have a *reasonable* match to the descriptor. This might represent a balance between some characteristics of the level that are fully met and others that are only barely met.

Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 2

Section A: Question 1(a)

Target: AO2 (10 marks): Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

| Level | Mark | Descriptor |
|----------|-------------|---|
| | 0 | No rewardable material |
| 1 | 1–3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little substantiation. The concept of value may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements. |
| 2 | 4–6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material, but mainly to expand or confirm matters of detail.• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and with some substantiation for assertions of value. The concept of value is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions. |
| 3 | 7–10 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.• Sufficient knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences, as well as to expand or confirm matters of detail.• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and based on valid criteria although justification is not fully substantiated. Explanation of value takes into account relevant considerations such as the nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. |

Section A: Question 1(b)

Target: A02 (15 marks): Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

| Level | Mark | Descriptor |
|----------|--------------|---|
| | 0 | No rewardable material |
| 1 | 1–3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little supporting evidence. The concept of reliability may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements. |
| 2 | 4–7 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis, by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material but mainly to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. The concept of reliability is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions. |
| 3 | 8–11 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.• Detailed knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of weight takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria, with some justification. |
| 4 | 12–15 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion.• Deploys well-selected knowledge of the historical context, but mainly to illuminate or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material. Displays some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may not be fully substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement. |

Section B

Target: AO1 (25 marks): Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

| Level | Mark | Descriptor |
|----------|--------------|---|
| | 0 | No rewardable material |
| 1 | 1–6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision. |
| 2 | 7–12 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision. |
| 3 | 13–18 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although some mainly descriptive passages may be included.• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision. |
| 4 | 19–25 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision. |

Section A: indicative content

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

| Question | Indicative content |
|-----------|--|
| 1a | <p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme.</p> <p>The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are required to analyse the source and consider its value for an enquiry into the reasons for the stagnation of the economy under Brezhnev.</p> <p>1. The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Indicates that the economy stagnated because the command economy failed ('exhausted the possibilities of the communist -controlled command economy'; 'developed socialism' had led to stagnation in the economy)• Provides evidence that the stagnation was caused by spending on the military ('The stagnation was caused particularly by excessive efforts in the military sphere.')• Implies that Brezhnev's lack of economic understanding was responsible for the stagnation ('Brezhnev could not grasp the significance'). <p>2. The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Dmitri Volkogonov is in a good position to know about the management of economic policy under Brezhnev because he had had access to the Soviet leadership• As a member of the Soviet Army's Political Administration, Dmitri Volkogonov is qualified to comment on the levels of military spending and its impact• Dmitri Volkogonov's account was written after the fall of the Soviet Union. He had more freedom to provide a critical account of the management of the economy. <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• By the 1980s, the Soviet Union devoted at least 25 per cent of its government spending to the military• In the years 1964-82, growth rates declined and the government was obliged to import grain to feed the Soviet citizens• The central planning was inefficient, technology was outdated and the obsession with growth led to the placing of a low priority on cost and quality• The apparent rise in production was not due to real increases in output but to higher prices. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p> |

| Question | Indicative content |
|-----------|---|
| 1b | <p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme.</p> <p>The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are required to analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into the advantages of Stalin's collectivisation programme for the Russian peasant.</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The speech is by Joseph Stalin who was responsible for the policy of collectivisation and clearly in a position to comment on its advantages • The speech is delivered in 1933, four years after the policy was launched in the countryside and at the height of the famine • The purpose of the speech is clearly propaganda and a justification of the policy. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Claims that peasants benefit from collectivisation because they are relieved of the burdens of ownership ('the collective farmer now has fewer cares than when he was on his individual farm') • Claims that peasants benefit from collectivisation because they are guaranteed food ('knowing that the collective farm will not leave him without bread') • Indicates that the Party will take responsibility for organising the farms ('It must now take over the direction of the collective farms, assume responsibility for the work') • Implies that collectivisation will allow improvement in farming by the introduction of modern machinery ('develop their farms on the basis of science and technology'). <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collectivisation benefitted the peasants by the introduction of large machinery such as tractors, which would be supplied by the state through huge machine and tractor stations • Collective farms provided homes for labourers and crèches and schools for their children, as well as canteens for meals, so that all members of the collective could be productive • The peasants resented the loss of their own farms and many reacted by burning their crops and barns, and killing their animals • Seven million peasants died in the forced collectivisation programme. In the years 1932-33, a famine raged in the countryside while food was requisitioned to feed the workers in the towns. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p> |

Section B: Indicative content

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

| Question | Indicative content |
|----------|---|
| 2 | <p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether Khrushchev's attempts to reform the Soviet system in the years 1953-64 were a complete failure.</p> <p>The arguments and evidence that Khrushchev's attempt to reform the Soviet system in the years 1953-64 can be seen as a complete failure should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Khrushchev's Secret Speech of 1956, which launched de-Stalinisation, alienated members of the Politburo because many had benefitted from Stalin's rule• Khrushchev retreated from de-Stalinisation in 1957 and authorised Brezhnev to suppress anti-communist activities. This limited the scope of reform• Khrushchev's decentralisation of the Party and its division into industrial and agricultural departments did not achieve the purpose of securing economic growth• Opposition to reform from the Party, including limitations imposed on the length of time a post could be held, ultimately led to Khrushchev's dismissal in 1964. <p>The arguments and evidence that Khrushchev's attempts to reform the Soviet system in the years 1953-64 should not be seen as a complete failure should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Khrushchev's greatest successes were to end the use of political terror against party officials and in ending Stalin's system of personal rule• De-Stalinisation succeeded in promoting a measure of artistic freedom• Khrushchev was successful in limiting the powers of the secret police and in releasing two million prisoners from the camps between 1953 and 1960• Khrushchev was successful in transferring powers from the central ministries to regional councils, in purging local party secretaries and in dividing the party into industrial and agricultural departments• Khrushchev's expansion of the party membership from 6.9 million in 1954 to 11 million in 1964 made the party more democratic. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p> |

3

Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.

Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about how far the Soviet government's treatment of culture changed in the years 1917-53.

The arguments and evidence that the Soviet government's treatment of culture changed in the years 1917-53 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- In the years 1917-20, Proletkult was promoted by Bogdanov. Later Lenin's concern about Proletkult led to its demise and *Agitprop* and avant-garde artists worked with the government
- In the 1920s the development of new trends in popular music, including jazz, were permitted. After 1935, music was forced to toe the line. Military music was favoured over jazz
- The Soviet government's treatment of art changed in the Cultural Revolution of the 1930s. Artistic freedom was ended and the Fellow Travellers from Lenin's era were replaced by loyal artists
- There was a growing emphasis on patriotism and defending the motherland as the threat of Nazi Germany increased, e.g. the film *Alexander Nevsky* (1938)
- Tighter controls were imposed from 1932 to 1953. Art was to pursue Social Realism. There was to be no experimentation as in the avant-garde movement. The emphasis was on conformity.

The arguments and evidence that the Soviet government's treatment of culture did not change in the years 1917-53 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- From the beginning, the Soviet government realised that culture could be used for political advantage. In the 1920s, V. Mayakovsky produced slogans and posters for the Party
- The Soviet government began to impose restrictions on art as early as the 1920s in response to the varied viewpoints emerging from Proletkult. This was continued under Stalin
- There were continuities in the Soviet government's aim for art throughout the period. Proletkult and Social Realism were effective propaganda in emphasising the importance of ordinary people
- The Soviet government maintained the attitude that culture was to be used for the service of the state. It did not ever accept the view of 'art for art's sake', which was seen as a bourgeois heresy.

Other relevant material must be credited.

| | |
|----------|--|
| 4 | <p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the extent to which Soviet education policy was successful in the years 1918-41.</p> <p>The arguments and evidence that Soviet education policy was successful in the years 1918-41 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• From 1927 all children received four years of primary school education; by 1928 60 per cent of Soviet children of primary age were in school, 10 per cent higher than before the revolution• The education of adults to improve literacy was successful during the Five Year Plans; by 1939 over 94 per cent of Soviet citizens were literate• There was a massive expansion of education under Stalin with 95 per cent of children in primary school by 1932; 1.5 million children completed secondary education in 1939 compared to 216,000 in 1928• There was a considerable expansion of higher education under Stalin. The number of universities grew and the number of students expanded significantly• Control of the curriculum under Stalin was successful in instilling Soviet values in young people. <p>The arguments and evidence Soviet education policy was not successful in the years 1918-41 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• During the civil war and the early years of the NEP, there were insufficient resources to invest in education and Lunacharsky's vision of free schooling for all to the age of 16 was not achieved• Under the NEP, fees had to be paid for secondary education, which meant it was dominated by middle class children; only 3 per cent of working class children finished secondary school• In the 1920s, the majority of secondary school teachers had been trained before the revolution. They used traditional methods and taught the achievements of the Tsars rather than class struggle• The progressive methods of education pioneered in the 1920s led to a decline in teachers' authority. The chaotic situation was abandoned in the Great Retreat of 1936. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p> |
|----------|--|