



Pearson
Edexcel

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2022

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced
A 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 or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

January 2022

Publication Code: WHI02_1C_2201_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

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.

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 why Stalin introduced the collectivisation of agriculture.</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">• It implies that collectivisation is essential in order to keep pace with the demand for grain ('The basis of our grain difficulties ... production of grain is not keeping pace with the increase in the demand')• It claims that small-scale farming is the cause of the slow rate of grain production ('just farming for the survival of each peasant family and this yields little grain.')• It implies that large-scale collectivisation will allow mechanisation and improved yields ('use machines... to increase the productivity of labour... produces the maximum quantity of grain.'). <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">• Stalin was the Soviet leader and in control of the economic policy. He was clearly in a position to outline Soviet policy towards agriculture• The speech was made at the start of the process of collectivisation and focuses on Stalin's expectations from collectivisation• The criticism of some aspects of the October Revolution gives the speech a candid tone. <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">• There was a 2-million-ton shortfall in the amount of grain needed in the Soviet Union in 1928• By 1928, Stalin opposed Lenin's NEP and was of the opinion that so-called 'kulaks' were hoarding grain• The collectivisation of agriculture with greater mechanisation was intended to release workers for industry, whilst expanding the yield of grain. <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 changes in the lives of women in Lenin's 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"> • Filipenko was a mother and factory worker before and after the October Revolution and was in an excellent position to comment on changes in the lives of women in Lenin's Russia • Filipenko produced the account in 1924 and was thus able to reflect on the impact across the whole of Lenin's rule • The account is entirely focused on the positive impacts of the Revolution on women and has a propagandistic tone. <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"> • It suggests that women became more equal to men ('my husband was enrolled in the party, and we work together as comrades') • It implies that the Lenin's rule brought about significant improvements in childcare ('bring the children to the nursery... They gained weight') • It provides evidence that the roles for women were expanded ('my work as a delegate, with various hospitals, maternity homes, children's homes') • It claims that the impact was wholly positive ('nursery solved our problems', 'My life is no longer without purpose'). <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"> • The 1918 Family Code permitted the dissolution of marriages, without grounds, at the request of either partner. Thousands of women were divorced by their husbands and forced to raise children alone • The Zhenotdel was set up in 1919. It championed the cause of female emancipation, organised childcare facilities and encouraged women to join the Party • The provision of crèches was short-lived. The cost proved too high for the government and many children ended up on the streets while their mothers worked • Political involvement by women was limited. In 1918, only 5 per cent of voting delegates were women and this percentage declined thereafter. <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, in the years 1917-53, the approach to the arts by Stalin's government was very similar to the approach to the arts by Lenin's government.</p> <p>The arguments and evidence that, in the years 1917-53, the approach to the arts by Stalin's government was very similar to the approach to the arts by Lenin's government should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Both Lenin and Stalin's governments used the arts in the service of the state, to reflect and promote socialist ideology• Low literacy levels meant that both Lenin's and Stalin's governments placed great emphasis on the use of visual arts to spread the socialist message• Both Lenin's and Stalin's governments used film to glorify the state and its achievements. Eisenstein was the most celebrated director under both regimes• Both Lenin's government, after 1921, and Stalin's government exercised controls on what artists could produce. <p>The arguments and evidence that, in the years 1917-53, the approach to the arts by Stalin's government was different from the approach to the arts by Lenin's government should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Stalin was suspicious of avant-garde and experimental techniques and favoured the traditional approach under Social Realism, whereas experimental arts had flourished in the early years of Lenin's regime• Stalin only allowed proletarian art expressed through Social Realism, whereas Lenin had believed that the proletariat could learn from bourgeois culture and permitted its production• Stalin abolished the Association of Proletarian Writers (RAPP) and writers had to join the Union of Soviet Writers and focus on achievements under Stalin, whereas under Lenin, writers had to join RAPP and were encouraged to write about proletarian achievements• Stalin's government removed all artists whose loyalty to socialism was in question, whereas Lenin's government had tolerated 'fellow travellers' who were ambivalent towards socialism. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
<p>3</p>	<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 the reform of industry and agriculture in the Soviet Union in the years 1953-64 was successful.</p> <p>The arguments and evidence that the reform of industry and agriculture in the Soviet Union in the years 1953-64 was successful should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Khrushchev’s policy of reducing quotas and introducing higher prices for everything produced above the target led to higher output and a 25 per cent rise in farm incomes in the years 1953-56 • Investment in farm equipment and fertilisers led to a 30 per cent increase in the number of tractors available and a 40 per cent increase in the amount of fertiliser produced • The Virgin Lands policy succeeded in increasing the amount of land farmed in the Soviet Union. The total area sown increased from 18.2 million hectares in 1953 to 97.4 million hectares in 1964 • Khrushchev’s industrial reform, with a focus on light industry, was successful in increasing production of chemicals and consumer goods in the years 1959-64. <p>The arguments and evidence that the reform of industry and agriculture in the Soviet Union in the years 1953-64 was not successful should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Khrushchev’s Corn Campaign was a failure. Farmers in the Ukraine only produced 50 per cent of the corn per hectare that was produced in the United States. There was insufficient animal feed produced in 1959-64 • Soviet agriculture remained extremely inefficient. The Virgin Lands scheme was expensive and agriculture continued to be labour intensive • After initial increases, rates of agricultural growth slowed and targets were not met. The climate was not suited to maize production, there was insufficient modern equipment and lack of storage led to waste • The nature of the plans, based on meeting targets, led to problems, e.g. factories produced thick steel because it made it easier to meet weight targets, but light industries needed thin steel to produce consumer goods. <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 the nature of government under Gorbachev was very different from the nature of government under Brezhnev.</p> <p>The arguments and evidence that the whether the nature of government under Gorbachev was very different from the nature of government under Brezhnev should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The character of Gorbachev’s government was different because Gorbachev replaced Brezhnev’s gerontocracy, in which senior officials maintained positions for long periods, with younger reformers • Under Brezhnev members of the Supreme Soviet were appointed. This was different under Gorbachev. Gorbachev introduced democratisation whereby candidates for the Supreme Soviet stood for elections in which communists and independents had to canvas voters to be elected • The power of the Communist Party in government was different. Under Brezhnev, the Supreme Soviet depended on the party leadership. Gorbachev’s reforms made it partly independent and weakened the power of the Communist Party • Under Brezhnev, the Communist Party maintained central control of the republics, whereas, at the end of Gorbachev’s rule, the new Union Treaty of 1991 allowed the republics to determine if they wanted to be voluntary members of the Union. <p>The arguments and evidence that whether the nature of government under Gorbachev was similar to the nature of government under Brezhnev should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system consisting of a centralised Communist Party, which controlled the states of the Soviet Union, and regional parties in the republics, which obeyed the Party, was maintained under both Brezhnev and Gorbachev • The Communist Party, with control over the economy, army, police and media, was the most significant element in the system of government under both Brezhnev and Gorbachev • After the removal Kosygin in 1970, Brezhnev held ultimate authority over the government. This was very similar under Gorbachev, e.g. the authority Gorbachev assumed after his appointment as President of the Soviet Union in 1990 • Under both Brezhnev and Gorbachev, the ideological theory of the government remained the same, i.e. the creation of a form of democracy based on the will of the Proletariat of the USSR. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

