



# **Mark scheme**

January 2020

Pearson Edexcel International  
Advanced Level in History (WHI02/1C)

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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

January 2020

Publication Code: WHI02\_1C\_2001\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2020

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- 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.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- 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.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little substantiation. The concept of value may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.</li><li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material, but mainly to expand or confirm matters of detail.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>7–10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• Sufficient knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences, as well as to expand or confirm matters of detail.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>

### 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.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little supporting evidence. The concept of reliability may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis, by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.</li><li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material but mainly to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>8–11</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• Detailed knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>12–15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>

## 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
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li><li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li><li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li><li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>7–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li><li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>13–18</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li><li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>19–25</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li><li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>

## Section A: Indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
<b>1a</b>	<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 approaches to education in the Soviet Union in the 1920s.</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"><li>• It provides evidence that children had control over their own learning ('students were left almost entirely to their own resources', 'Every student was free to choose')</li><li>• It provides evidence that the role of the teacher was limited to assisting pupils ('teacher gives help only when asked')</li><li>• It suggests that there was a lax approach to pupil discipline ('While one seldom witnesses actual disorder in the classroom, one is also unlikely to find the strict order').</li></ul> <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"><li>• William Henry Chamberlin was an American journalist and able to bring an outsider's perspective to the assessment of Soviet education</li><li>• The content of the source makes it clear that Chamberlin has visited Soviet schools and is therefore able to comment from a position of personal experience</li><li>• The language and tone of the source, with a focus on positives and negatives, suggest an impartial view</li><li>• The date of the source indicates that Chamberlin has been able to reflect on the approaches employed over the whole of the 1920s.</li></ul> <p>3. Knowledge of the 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"><li>• In 1918 the Soviet government abolished corporal punishment, homework and exams</li><li>• Lunacharsky, director of education policy, favoured progressive teaching methods</li><li>• The authority of teachers was reduced. Teachers were designated as school workers who shared control with older pupils.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
<b>1b</b>	<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 status of women in Stalinist Russia.</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"> <li>• The purpose of the source is clearly to celebrate Soviet women and is therefore focused on the highest achievements</li> <li>• The nature of the source, the official newspaper of the Communist Party, is bound to emphasise the positive development in the status of women under a Communist government</li> <li>• The date of the speech and the article show that it has been possible to assess the status of women across a whole decade of Stalinist rule in Russia.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>• It claims that women are valued in Stalinist Russia ('the heroic and energetic path taken by women', 'secured an honoured place')</li> <li>• It implies that women are regarded as equal to men in employment and political life ('powerful economic leaders... became an engineer ...director of the Moscow regional railway.'; 'The deputies ... include 189 women')</li> <li>• It provides evidence that women still have a primary role in taking care of the family ('benefits given to mothers with many children, and about the steady growth in the number of nurseries and kindergartens.').</li> </ul> <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 the content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Women joined the industrial workforce in large numbers during the Five Year Plans; by 1940 13 million women were working in industry</li> <li>• Women in industry were only paid 60–65 per cent of men's wages</li> <li>• Stalin's Great Retreat, announced in 1936, placed an emphasis on women's traditional roles as wives and mothers</li> <li>• Women were consistently under-represented in the highest levels of the party, and in the 1930s were expected to play the role of 'wife-activists' who played a mothering role.</li> </ul> <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 the extent to which Stalin's policies towards industry differed from Khrushchev's policies towards industry.</p> <p>The arguments and evidence that Stalin's and Khrushchev's policies towards industry differed should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The focus of Stalin's policy towards industry was the modernisation and development of heavy industry; by contrast Khrushchev's focus was on the development of light industry</li><li>• Stalin's industrial policy was committed to high spending on military production; Khrushchev cut military spending in the mid-1950s and diverted resources into consumer production</li><li>• There were differences in the organisation of production. -Under Stalin, Gosplan played a central role in setting targets, whereas Khrushchev decentralised power from Gosplan and established 105 regional planning agencies, <i>sovnarkhoz</i></li><li>• Stalin's policy to expand heavy industry and military production was more successful in achieving its aims than Khrushchev's expansion of light industry.</li></ul> <p>The arguments and evidence that Stalin's and Khrushchev's policies towards industry were similar should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Khrushchev's cuts to military spending were only temporary. The growing conflict with the USA meant that in 1958 and 1962 he increased military spending and like Stalin focused on militarisation</li><li>• Similar to Stalin, Khrushchev's industrial programme was part of the command economy that established plans setting a range of production targets</li><li>• Both Stalin and Khrushchev frequently intervened to change the targets for industrial production</li><li>• Both Stalin and Khrushchev had problems with low productivity and the poor quality of goods produced.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<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 Andropov was successful in suppressing dissidents in the Soviet Union in the years 1965–82.</p> <p>The arguments and evidence that Andropov was successful in suppressing dissidents in the Soviet Union in the years 1965–82 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Andropov made the suppression of dissidence a priority in his career as leader of the KGB. The Fifth Directorate kept files on all dissidents and the KGB acted quickly to crush dissident activity</li> <li>• The banishment of dissidents to the outlying regions of the Soviet Union and the removal of Soviet citizenship was effective in suppressing dissidents and deterring others from criticising the state</li> <li>• The threat of arrest succeeded in suppressing dissidents. In 1970, Solzhenitsyn decided not to travel to the West to collect his Nobel Prize because he feared he would be rearrested when he returned</li> <li>• The KGB monitored public opinion using techniques such as phone tapping, intercepting mail and disguising as Westerners. Fear of these methods suppressed dissident views.</li> </ul> <p>The arguments and evidence that Andropov was not successful in suppressing dissidents in the Soviet Union in the years 1965–82 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Sinyavsky/Daniel trial in 1966 acted as the catalyst for criticism of the Soviet state; many dissidents contacted foreign sources and published their views in the West</li> <li>• The actions taken against dissidents did not prevent historian Roy Medvedev and writer Valentin Rasputin from criticising aspects of the Soviet state</li> <li>• In the 1970s, intellectuals, including scientists and sociologists, used Soviet law against the regime. They demanded the freedoms promised in the Constitution and promoted their views through their foreign contacts</li> <li>• The Helsinki Accords, signed in 1975, limited the actions that could be taken against dissidents. Violations of the agreement were publicised in the West and embarrassed the Soviet leadership.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
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 whether Yeltsin's election as president of Russia in June 1991 was the most significant development in the weakening of Soviet government in the years 1982–91.</p> <p>The arguments and evidence that Yeltsin's election as president of Russia in June 1991 was the most significant development in the weakening of Soviet government in the years 1982–91 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Russia was the most important republic in the Soviet Union. Yeltsin's election with a 57 per cent majority gave him legitimacy as leader of Russia and undermined the Soviet government led by Gorbachev</li> <li>• Yeltsin used his position as president of Russia to act against cornerstones of the Soviet system. In July 1991 he decreed that members of political parties could not be active in state organisations including the KGB</li> <li>• Yeltsin's election encouraged conservatives to believe that he and not Gorbachev was in control. This was one factor that led them to launch the coup in August 1991, an event that fatally weakened Soviet government</li> <li>• Yeltsin's position gave him the authority to intervene in the coup against the conservatives of the Communist Party and he used his authority to ban the party in November 1991.</li> </ul> <p>The arguments and evidence that Yeltsin's election as president of Russia in June 1991 was not the most significant development/ there were other, more significant developments in the weakening of Soviet government in the years 1982–91 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yeltsin had already emerged as a threat and an agent to weaken Soviet government in the 1989 elections when he won 89 per cent of the vote in Moscow for a place on the Congress of People's Deputies</li> <li>• Soviet government was already weakened as a consequence of the economic failures of the 1980s. Hardliners were then alienated by Gorbachev's abandonment of Marxist economic theory</li> <li>• Gorbachev's policy of <i>Glasnost</i> alienated Communist hardliners because it encouraged criticism of aspects of the government that were not working effectively. The criticisms and the reactions weakened Soviet government</li> <li>• Gorbachev's attempt to introduce a 'socialist democracy' in 1988 weakened Soviet government. -The subsequent elections strengthened anti-party and nationalist groups but did not produce strong government.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>