



Examiners' Report June 2018

GCSE History 1HI0 30

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 2018

Publications Code 1HI0_30_1806_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

Introduction

Most candidates seemed well prepared for this option and they often took the opportunity to showcase an impressive knowledge of the social, political and economic factors at play in Russia and the Soviet Union 1917-41. Candidates were generally well prepared for the question styles with a pleasing range of valid approaches to answering the interpretations questions a particular strength.

The Modern World Depth Studies are designed to allow candidates to understand the complexity of a society within a short coherent period and the question styles reflect this. Section B provides a single enquiry based on two interpretations and two contemporary sources with the focus in this paper being the problems facing the Provisional Government. The questions in this section form a coherent package leading to a final question in which candidates, having explored the utility of the provided sources, the different views presented in the interpretations and the reasons for those differences, are invited to judge the extent to which they agree with one of the interpretations. Because of the specific focus on Section B, the questions in Section A are designed to explore other areas of the specification which are not covered in B.

In Q1 candidates are asked to provide two supported inferences from Source A. No marks were available for candidates who either provided simple paraphrases of the source or ignored the specific focus of the question.

In Q2, the focus will always be on causation but the question does not require a judgement to be made or for the answer to prioritise or show interaction of factors and marks are unavailable to reward this evaluation, however strongly argued. The most successful candidates showed a consistent analytical focus throughout their answers and were able to access Level 4 by doing so. In question 2 the stimulus points in the question will often be useful reminders to candidates of specific areas of content which they can write about. Candidates do not need to use these stimulus points but there is an expectation that there will be some depth of knowledge, shown by three discrete aspects of the question being covered, although this does not mean candidates need to identify three different causes or events. It was pleasing to see that candidates had understood this expectation. Many answers were clearly structured in paragraphs, making it easy for the examiner to identify the different aspects being covered, while others produced extended explanatory paragraphs covering the different aspects.

All of the sub-questions in Section B relate to either the two interpretations, Sources B and C, or both the sources and interpretations, AO3 skills and AO4 skills respectively. Q3 (a) targets the ability to analyse and evaluate source utility and, in doing so, introduces the enquiry which will be dealt with in further detail in questions 3(b), 3(c) and 3(d).

In Q3(a) candidates are expected to evaluate the content taking account of the provenance of the sources and apply contextual knowledge in making judgements about utility. These three strands are interdependent and should be dealt with together, rather than in isolation. There is no need to compare the two sources although a few candidates took the unnecessary additional step of trying to determine which source was 'most useful' which is not the focus of the question and therefore is not rewardable.

Q 3(b) and Q 3(c) examine the views expressed in the two provided interpretations. Candidates are expected to identify the main difference between the views in Q3(b) and use the interpretations to support those claims. This question was generally well done and most candidates who were able to show how they differed could also support their answers. The focus in Q3(c) is on why the interpretations might differ and this question was more challenging and the specific areas of weakness explained below should be read carefully. It is not possible to provide effectively

substantiated reasons why the interpretations are different based on such things as where and when the interpretations were published although a number of candidates did attempt to do so without success. See specific information about Q3c below.

Q3(d) carries the highest number of marks on the paper. Successful candidates will have already seen how the views in the interpretations are different, why this might be the case and, in completing Q3(a) have understood that there is likely to be evidence in support of both interpretations. They are now asked how far they agree with one of the interpretations. The strongest answers to Q3(d), therefore, focused clearly on the interpretations themselves, reviewing the alternative views and coming to a substantiated judgement. Candidates who focused exclusively on the view provided in Interpretation 2 and used this as a basis for an essay based on their own knowledge were less successful than those who considered the alternative views from both interpretations. There is no expectation that both interpretations are dealt with in equal depth but both should be examined explicitly. The use of contextual knowledge is an important element in this evaluation but it must be precisely selected to support the evaluation and not just used to display aspects of the topic which the candidate has revised but are not relevant to the enquiry. In addition, some of the strongest answers were able to show how the differences of view in the two interpretations were conveyed in reaching their overall judgements.

Examiners reported some impressive answers to Q3(d) and many candidates were able to engage confidently with the interpretations, taking a range of approaches. However, even weaker candidates were able to access this challenging question and often provided evaluative responses leading to an overall conclusion. Only a very few candidates were unable to identify the view being offered by the interpretations, so the majority were able to construct a response in relation to these views. Candidates rarely seemed rushed and full answers were generally provided showing that timing wasn't generally an issue on this paper.

Sufficient space is provided in the exam papers for all questions to be answered in full and although some candidates did write on extra sheets they were not always as successful as those who produced more concise answers. It is of vital importance that candidates do not continue answers from one question in the space reserved for another and, if they wish to write more than the booklet allows, they should clearly identify this on the paper and ask for additional sheets. It is intended that the space provided is sufficient for the majority of the candidates to be able to construct a fully rewardable response.

Spelling, punctuation and grammar were assessed on Q3(d) and the most impressive aspect of this strand was the use of specialist terms which perhaps reflects the detailed understanding most candidates had of this depth study.

Question 1

In Q 1 candidates are invited to make a valid inference about process of collectivisation. There are two marks available for each inference – one for the inference itself and one for the supporting information. Most candidates seemed to understand how to make an inference, and most used the content of the source to provide support for the inference. Such candidates tended to make inferences about the reluctance of people to join collectives, referencing the 75% of people unwilling to join that the source mentions, or inferences which suggested that collectivisation was forced on the peasants, which could be supported by the reference to peasants not entering the collectives willingly. A significant minority of candidates made an inference which was not to do with the process of collectivisation, but was more to do with life in Stalin's Russia generally.

Candidates used the table provided for the answers well and only those who also explained *why* their supporting information helped to support the inference (which is not required) had to use additional space for their answers.

- 1 Give **two** things you can infer from Source A about the **process of collectivisation**.

Complete the table below to explain your answer.

(i) What I can infer:

Peasants were forced into collectivisation.

Details in the source that tell me this:

The peasant wrote 'we have not entered the collective willingly.'

(ii) What I can infer:

A use of fear was used to make people obey by the process of collectivisation.

Details in the source that tell me this:

If anyone spoke out against joining 'he was threatened with arrest and forced labour.'



This candidate has made two inferences about the process of collectivisation supported by direct quotes from the source, so gains full marks.



Think about the space provided – inferences do not need to be explained in great detail and a single sentence is enough.

1 Give **two** things you can infer from Source A about the process of collectivisation.

Complete the table below to explain your answer.

(i) What I can infer:

Poor peasant ~~are~~ were against
Joining the collectives

Details in the source that tell me this:

"In our village we have
not entered the collective
willing"

(ii) What I can infer:

Many peasants wanted their
own freedom of ~~speech~~ speech

Details in the source that tell me this:

"collectivisation could work if
peasants joined the collectives voluntarily
and were not made to join"



The candidate has provided one inferences with direct support from the source. However, the second inference is not about the process of collectivisation and the details given do not support the inference.



Candidates should read the whole question to make sure that their inferences relate to the specific question – in this case the process of collectivisation.

Question 2

Candidates performed well on this question and the reasons for Stalin introducing the purges appeared to have been very well taught. The majority of candidates were able to go beyond the stimulus points, with reference to three aspects of content, and relate these to the question. It was noteworthy that even candidates with more limited knowledge of the content were often able to provide a clear structure in their answers, if not a clear analytical focus. The stimulus points are provided to help candidates to link the question they have been asked with the material they have studied and to provide a prompt to the analysis of the process of change.

The majority of candidates were confident in discussing Stalin's paranoia as a reason for the purges. This was often linked to Stalin's desire to maintain power and rid himself of the 'Old Bolsheviks.' There was a clear understanding of who they were and why Stalin wanted to be rid of them. Many candidates referred to the assassination of Kirov but a significant number merely narrated the details and were unable to clearly explain how this led to the purges beginning. Many candidates were also able to discuss the economic problems Russia faced and how the purges were a good way of providing scapegoats for the failures. There were a significant number of candidates who clearly focused on the question throughout and provided aspects of content beyond those in the stimulus, such as Stalin's fear of the Red Army as an alternative power base, to aid their causal explanation.

Less successful candidates were able to describe the economic problems facing Russia, but were unable to explain how these problems connected to the purges. Some candidates even suggested Stalin deliberately purged people to reduce the population.

Candidates did not need to provide a conclusion to show a sustained line of reasoning and those who were most successful showed a sustained focus on the question in every paragraph. Candidates who only really attempted any analysis in a conclusion struggled to meet the AO2 requirements at the higher levels. Candidates are not expected to prioritise or link factors at Level 4 and few attempted to do so. In cases where candidates did prioritise factors examiners were sometimes able to reward some aspects of the candidate's argument as showing a clear line of reasoning but it was not a strategy that automatically gained Levels 3 and 4.

At Level 2, candidates often described the features of the Cultural Revolution, or the Great Leap Forward and the famine that preceded it, which left links to the question too implicit to meet the AO2 focus on analysis. At Level 3 candidates were mainly focused on the conceptual focus of the question but sometimes lacked the wide-ranging knowledge required at Level 4. At Level 4 there were many sustained analytical responses supported by well-chosen examples which displayed clear understanding of the topic and these were often rewarded with full marks.

Overall, candidates were very comfortable with this style of question and produced a range of impressive answers.

2 Explain why Stalin introduced the purges in the Soviet Union in the 1930s.

(12)

You may use the following in your answer:

- economic problems
- the assassination of Kirov

You **must** also use information of your own.

Stalin introduced purging to get rid of the people that opposed him and his ideas. Russia suffered with economic problems so Stalin wanted Russia to move forward. He devised a New Economic Policy that people would have to follow. This included the 5 year plans that he set to give Russia a boost with industry. Targets were set for ~~producers~~ workers and they had to meet them otherwise they could be killed.

Gulags and show trials were different types of purging that Stalin used. Gulags were prison camps which forced labour for the occupants of the camp. People were sent ~~to~~ to ~~gulegs~~ gulags because Stalin wanted full control over Russia and did not want anybody ~~interfering~~ interfering with his success. Stalin made sure that everything that was broadcast about him was positive.

Books only contained praise about what he had done for the country, and artists could only present him as ^{how} he wanted people to see him. This was called The Cult of Personality. Stalin ~~also~~ censored certain things so that ~~me~~ he could remain a strong, stable leader. Anybody who went against his word or tried to influence other people were purged, keeping Stalin's name clean.

The Kulaks were the wealthier peasants in Russia and when Stalin introduced the idea of collectivisation, the Kulaks did not agree. They did not want to ~~work for the~~ give ~~state~~ up their crops to the state and began destroying their crops and animals so the state could not take them. This led to the Kulaks being completely wiped out, because Stalin wanted to get rid of them in case other peasants were influenced and began to stand up to him as well, which would cause Stalin to fall from the pedestal he was on and lose control over the peasants and workers.



The answer provides some information about the purges but does not adequately explain why they took place. This is implicit and the answer remains in level 2.



Organising the answer into paragraphs makes it clear to the examiner that three aspects of content have been covered. A sentence at the end of each section showing how it helps to answer the question can help to raise the AO2 level in an answer.

You may use the following in your answer:

- economic problems
- the assassination of Kirov

• persecution complex

You **must** also use information of your own.

The most important reason for Stalin introducing the purges in the 1930s was that he had a persecution complex - he believed that everyone was trying to kill him/usurp his power. He used the purges to eliminate anyone he saw as a potential rival: in 1936, Stalin hosted "show trials" where "old Bolsheviks" (including Zinoviev and Kamenev) were forced to confess to crimes against the USSR (through torture from the NKVD) and were ~~shot~~ executed. This not only allowed Stalin to remove potential rivals but also showed that his purging was justified. The show trials of Bukharin and Rykov in 1938 served a similar purpose, and Stalin purged 30,000 Red Army members (along with 50% of officers and 7 generals, including Supreme-Commander-in-Chief of the Red Army) as he believed they were becoming too powerful. 90% of the generals had been purged by 1941. Stalin also purged head of the NKVD Yezhov in 1938 after he became too influential, he was succeeded by deputy Beria who subsequently purged the NKVD and became deputy PM in 1941.

Another important reason for Stalin's introduction of the purges

was the assassination of Kirov in December 1934. Kirov was Stalin's friend, however he spoke out against Stalin in the 17th ~~Russian Congress~~ Communist Party Congress meeting in 1934, and there is evidence to show that Stalin ordered Kirov's assassination. Nevertheless, Stalin used Kirov's murder as an excuse to purge the Communist Party of his opponents, arresting 40,000 of Kirov's supporters in Leningrad in 1934 and arresting 9/135 members of the Bolshevik Central Committee in 1935. Kirov's murder was important for the introduction of the purges as it gave Stalin a reason to purge the Communist party.

A less important reason for Stalin's introduction of the purges was the economic problems faced by the USSR. In 1928, 55 engineers were arrested, accused of sabotage - 6 were shot and 49 were arrested. After this, Stalin used the threat of execution and gulags to force workers to meet the targets of the Gosplan and decrease absenteeism. However, this was not the primary goal of the purges and they actually ended up negatively affecting the 5 Year plans, with officials lying to satisfy unachievable Gosplan targets and oil and steel production decreasing in the third 5 Year Plan as individuals with expertise and higher ranks were purged off.



The candidate has covered three areas of content (Stalin's paranoia, assassination of Kirov and economic problems) and has, therefore, satisfied the requirements for Level 4 answers to go beyond the stimulus points and to show wide-ranging knowledge. In addition, detail is used to support the analysis, which is evident in every paragraph, rather than being provided simply as information.



This candidate has not provided a conclusion, instead, Level 4 has been reached by the focus on the question which is evident in every paragraph.

Question 3 (a)

Candidates need to approach the utility question bearing in mind that judgements about utility should be based on the usefulness of the sources for the specified enquiry, in this case the problems faced by the Provisional Government. The best responses were those that were able to address 'how useful' by establishing the strengths sources have as evidence before determining how far the limitations affect their usefulness. It is important for candidates to remember that judging utility may involve some comments about reliability but answers which focus solely on this aspect tend to be extremely negative towards the source material.

Reliability can only ever be a small element of utility because an unreliable source can still be very useful. It is also important that in judging utility, provenance is related to the content of the source. For example, many candidates pointed out that source B had been written by an American and being an outsider would make them more objective. Some candidates also pointed out that the author was a member of the Communist Party. Some candidates just ignored this extra bit of provenance, whilst others made general comments about him being biased. Source B provided many candidates with the opportunity to say it was useful because it was an official document. A significant minority did apply the provenance to test the content and questioned the usefulness in the light of this being a set of instructions rather than evidence of how people responded to them. Nevertheless many candidates also recognised the significance of the existence of Order Number 1 and the pressure it put on the Provisional Government.

It was disappointing to see the number of generic responses when the provenance of the sources was commented on. This part of the response is only likely to gain marks at Level 1 for this element of the mark scheme. Many candidates who offered otherwise quite interesting analysis of the content and applied excellent subject knowledge to the interpretation of the sources still had a tendency to fall back on simplistic judgements about provenance. There were some generalised comments made about Reed, Source A, being a reporter and therefore would exaggerate events. This was not evaluated in any way by comparing the content to the actual knowledge of events.

Many answers made good use of contextual knowledge but some well-prepared candidates spent too much time talking about the problems facing the Provisional Government without using that material to support reasoning about the sources' utility, becoming stuck in Level 2 at best for many of their points. In addition, it is not possible to gain credit for simply asserting that the candidate knows an aspect of the source to be true without using specific knowledge to demonstrate this. It is also worth noting that simple comprehension – it states, it shows – based on the assumption that such information is useful, remains low level. Developed statements about the usefulness of the content can reach Level 2 but answers consisting solely of such comments are unlikely to progress beyond mid-Level 2, irrespective of the length of the answer, because the other strands of the Assessment Objective have not been addressed.

In attempting to analyse utility some candidates have obviously been encouraged to describe what is missing from the source and this led to some answers which could only be marked at Level 1 for this aspect of the mark scheme. Candidates should recognise that the sources were not written in order to be used by historians and they cannot cover every detail that might be useful in an investigation. The primary focus for all candidates should be to judge the utility of what is there rather than what isn't there. A pleasing majority of candidates did test the content of the source against their own knowledge to assess how useful it could be for example they applied their knowledge about the failures of the war to support the point made in source B, which states that all the soldiers were demanding an end to the war.

Answers reach Level 3 by assessing the usefulness of the content in the light of the provenance and the candidate's own knowledge; the criteria used to make the judgement could be its accuracy (this is not the same as reliability), the relevance of the source, the way it could be used by the historian, how representative the source is etc. An evaluation of a source's utility should be explicit about the criteria being used, for example an answer should be able to explain that while the language may be emotive, the facts included can be supported from the candidate's own knowledge so the source is very useful despite any loaded language. Similarly, the answer might show an awareness of the different uses of a source for this enquiry: Order Number 1 may only be a list of instructions from the Soviet, but it implies a threat to the power of the Provisional Government in many important areas.

Although a judgement should be reached on the overall usefulness of each source, there is no requirement to compare the sources or to use them in combination and no marks are available for this. Doing this wastes time that could be used to explain the judgement made with regard to utility.

3 (a) Study Sources B and C.

How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into the problems faced by the Provisional Government?

Explain your answer, using Sources B and C and your knowledge of the historical context.

(8)

Source B and C are very useful for an enquiry to the problems faced by the Provisional Government, as they are about how there was havoc and mayhem in Petrograd due to the war not ending.

Source B is written by an American who ~~was~~ was a member of the American Communist Party. Reed ~~of~~ ~~is~~ also was a journalist who lived in Russia in. This clearly demonstrates the significance of the source being useful as a journalist gets information on the key events. More so, in source B there are soldiers who want ~~to~~ WWI to stop as it was affecting Russia severely. The soldiers ~~threatened~~ stated that the army would leave the trenches and go home if the war didn't stop. In 1917 Tsar Nicholas II was in charge. Tsar was unexperienced in war and he didn't listen to the Duma; this led to Russia being

affected as he was a terrible leader.

Source C is an order that was published by the Petrograd Soviet of workers' and soldiers' Deputies on 1 March 1917. Around this time it was international women's day which was on 23 February and that was the breakout of severe rioting. Furthermore, the riots were also worst in 4 March. More so, source C is clearly demonstrating its importance as it is portraying how the soldiers want the committees to be chosen from the lower ranks of soldiers and sailors. In addition, the Provisional Government's orders won't be carried out when the soldiers' and sailors' decisions and orders are ~~contra~~ contradicted.

Ultimately source B is mainly focused on the ~~activity~~ ~~with~~ brutal activity within Petrograd, and ~~more~~ source C is mainly focused on the demands from Petrograd Soviets ~~we~~ of workers' and soldiers' that wanted change.



At Level 2 candidates will make developed comments related to the content of the sources and/or their provenance. In this case the candidate states the provenance, without evaluating the significance of, for example, Reed being a member of the Communist party. They then give information from the source and test is against their own knowledge. They repeat this formula with Source C.



Candidates using precise knowledge to support points about the specific aspects of the source will always perform better than those who just use this question to write about the topic.

3 (a) Study Sources B and C.

How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into the problems faced by the Provisional Government?

Explain your answer, using Sources B and C and your knowledge of the historical context.

(8)

Source B describes the problems the government faced from the soldiers. It highlights how unhappy soldiers were with the government because they were still in the war. This source is useful for identifying a key problem with the lack of support from the military. So when the government tried to take control like in the Kornilov revolt, it failed. The source is from a book written by a communist living in Russia¹⁹¹⁷ and it implies that changes to the government needed to be made. Because it's written by a communist it may over emphasise the lack of support for the provisional government and does not fully explore all the problems they faced so doesn't paint the full picture.

Source C is a list of orders from the Petrograd Soviets underlining how they soldiers should go about setting up committees.

and following orders. There is an overall emphasis that officers and officials are not to be trusted. This source is useful for an enquiry into one of the problems the provisional government faced as it highlights how the Petrograd Soviets were in command of the army and not the provisional government. So the government had little military support. The list of rules was published in 1917 by the Petrograd Soviets to tell their followers in the army what to do. So it is from at the time which makes it more reliable, however it does not explain how or if these rules were enforced making it less useful. Also other sources would also have to be used to give other problems they faced.



This makes some developed points about how the provenance might have an impact on the utility of the content of the source. For example, Order Number 1 highlights the lack of control of the Provisional Government over the army but recognises that the impact of this cannot be seen.



There is no need to compare sources in order to achieve full marks. This comparison does not detract from the quality of the response but it does not add to it.

Question 3 (b)

In this question candidates need to identify the difference between the views given in Interpretations 1 and 2 about the specified enquiry, in this case the problems facing the Provisional Government. Candidates are expected to identify a difference and evidence this by selecting relevant points from the interpretations. It should be noted that the interpretations do not necessarily offer contrasting views, merely different views.

Responses which asserted differences without support, for example stating that Interpretation 1 suggests the biggest problem facing the provisional Government was the Soviet's creation of an alternative authority, whereas Interpretation 2 claims that the biggest problem was continuing with the war, stayed in Level 1.

Level 2 was achieved when the candidates indicated a clear difference of view and supported it with detail from the extracts. Most candidates were able to score full marks.

A small number of candidates ignored the focus of the enquiry and selected general points of difference from the interpretations. No marks were awarded to candidate who did this. Candidates' success in Q3(d) may be influenced by how well they identify the views given in the interpretations. Therefore, those who did identify the differences of view about the problems facing the Provisional Government in this question, Q3(b), were able to build on this more successfully than those who failed to, when it came to answering Q3(d).

Some candidates tried to use extra space in the booklet to write very full answers but in many cases these were simply lengthy paraphrases of the interpretations which did not identify the main difference between them and failed to gain additional marks.

(b) **Study Interpretations 1 and 2. They give different views about the problems faced by the Provisional Government.**

What is the main difference between these views?

Explain your answer, using details from both interpretations.

(4)

The main difference between these interpretations is that interpretation 1 is talking about the ~~success~~ power of the Petrograd Soviet over the provisional government, whereas interpretation 2 is saying that the provisional government made their own mistakes. This is evident as interpretation 1 says that the provisional government could not take "executive action" without the agreement of the Petrograd Soviet, therefore stressing the Petrograd Soviet's power over the provisional government. Moreover, interpretation 2 says that the provisional government made their own problems when it says that Russia "had to" keep fighting the war. This stresses the immense problems the provisional government got themselves in to have to carry on a war to get supplies.



The candidate has clearly identified a major difference between the interpretations and has supported this effectively with quotations.



Once a difference has been identified, short quotations from the interpretations or a paraphrase of some of the points made will be enough to provide the support required for Level 2.

Question 3 (c)

Moving on from identifying the differences in view in Q3(b), candidates need to explain a reason for those differences in Q3(c). Only one reason, effectively substantiated, is required to get into Level 2. Successful candidates were able to show an understanding of why historians come to different conclusions, or have different emphases. This might be due to a variety of factors such as the weight given to different sources, in this case candidates might refer to the support given by Source B for Interpretation 2 and by Source C for Interpretation 1. Some candidates also discussed the different emphases of the Interpretations, with Interpretation 1 concentrating on the political impact of Order Number 1 and Interpretation 2 focusing on the economic and social impacts of the continuation of the war.

Successful candidates selected one of the above approaches and evidenced their reasoning with specific support from the Interpretations. Around half of the candidates were able to do this, with most opting for explaining the differences in terms of the weight given to the selection of sources by the historians. Those who stayed in Level 1 did not fully understand the nature of the question. Some gave a valid reason for the difference in view, but failed to support this reason, stating for example that the views differ because the historians have used different evidence, but not providing evidence for this.

A significant minority of candidates attempted to speculate as to the background motivations of the historians which is not a requirement of this question. Candidates who did this tried to use the date of the Interpretation, the title of the book from which it came, or the nature of the interpretation as the reason for the differences in view. Candidates who did this stayed in Level 1 as they were unable to support their ideas with evidence from the Interpretations. There is no requirement in the specification to address the historiography and the views being presented are alternative views not directed towards a controversy or specific debate. Candidates should appreciate that historians legitimately have differences of view, to come to different conclusions when they conduct their enquiries into the evidence. The question is rooted in the interpretations that have been provided and therefore speculation about possible reasons for differences cannot be rewarded here if it is based on the provenance or what else might or might not have been said; candidates must be able to support their comments with evidence from the provided interpretations. The interpretations are not being used as evidence and therefore need to be treated differently from the sources, and without reference to the provenance.

A troubling number of candidates gained no marks on this question as they merely repeated what had been said in question 3(b).

- (c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the problems faced by the Provisional Government.

You may use Sources B and C to help explain your answer.

(4)

Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the problems faced by the Provisional Government as they gave weight to and used different sources. Source B suggests that the soldiers were all speaking out and "demanding an end to the war". This may have been used by Interpretation 2 which describes the "most persistent problem was the war against Germany". On the other hand, Source C shows the limitation of the Provisional Government's power through Order Number 1, detailing that their orders "shall only be carried out when they do not contradict" those of the Peterograd Soviet. This is reflected in Interpretation 1 which describes how it "could not take effective action without the agreement of the Peterograd Soviet".



This candidate has gained full marks by explaining how the writers have given different weight to different sources in writing their interpretations and the answer is substantiated by references to the interpretations.

(c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the problems faced by the Provisional Government.

You may use Sources B and C to help explain your answer.

(4)

One reason why these two Interpretations were different because the first one looked at the problems in a social and political way whereas the second one mostly focused on the problems that were ~~happene~~ happening between the countries and the war that effected many lives especially the peasants.



This candidate has made a good point about the difference in emphasis between the two interpretations but has not supported this with any evidence, such as quotes.

Question 3 (d)

This was the most challenging question of the paper, requiring students to show how what they had identified in Q3(a), Q3(b) and Q3(c) could be effectively used to explain why they agreed and disagreed with Interpretation 2. Interpretations 1 and 2 provide alternative views about the problems facing the Provisional Government. These views are not a controversy. This is the only time candidates will be tested on AO4: Analysis and evaluation of interpretations. Three elements are necessary for candidates to be successful: evaluation and judgement of the given interpretation, the analysis of the provided material, i.e. the 2 interpretations, and the deployment of contextual knowledge to support the evaluation.

The second strand of A04 requires an analysis of the Interpretations. In order to be successful candidates needed to correctly identify what Interpretation 2 was saying, in this case that the continuation of the war was the most important problem for the Provisional Government. Pleasingly most candidates were able to do this, identifying the interpretation clearly. Less successful candidates showed awareness but did not analyse the interpretation effectively. Successful candidates were able not only to identify the gist but also to pick apart the details of the interpretation and show how these details were valid using their own knowledge, for example candidates might support the point given in Interpretation 2 about the 'severe social and economic problems' by discussing the severe food shortages caused by loss of labour needed for the war.

Candidates were also expected to use Interpretation 1 to provide an alternative to the view given in Interpretation 2. In this case Interpretation 1 suggests it was the dual authority that was the most pressing problem for the Provisional Government. Again, successful candidates provided good analysis of the interpretation and provided contextual knowledge in support of the points made.

A significant minority of candidates were less successful in terms of answering this question because they failed to use Interpretation 1. From Level 2 upwards this is a requirement of the mark scheme in terms of analysis of the provided material. Sadly, a small number of eloquent and analytical responses were unable to be awarded highly due to their failure to use Interpretation 1.

A very small number of candidates failed to use either interpretation and proceeded to approach the question as if it were simply asking about problems facing the Provisional Government. Candidates who did not engage with either interpretation, no matter what the quality of their contextual knowledge, failed to get out of Level 2. The target AO for this question is AO4, not AOs 1 and 2.

Most candidates were able to provide a degree of contextual knowledge to help answer the question. The most successful candidates used precise evidence to support both interpretations, including other aspects of content that may not have been specifically mentioned, for example the impact of the June offensive or the Kornilov Revolt. Candidates who used more generalised details were not as successful as candidates who used precise and well selected details to support their evaluation. A few candidates did not display any contextual knowledge, preferring to repeat bits of the Interpretations to support assertions made. Merely asserting agreement with points in the interpretation by saying 'from my own knowledge I know this to be true' is not sufficient evidence of contextual knowledge.

Most candidates were able to at least assert whether they agreed or disagreed with the view given in the interpretation. Many were able to justify their evaluation by explaining how their contextual knowledge supported this. An encouraging number of candidates were also able to provide a line of reasoning that was coherent and logically structured which led to a supported judgement. Best fit marking means that candidates can get into level 4 even if they are not able to show how differences of view are conveyed. It is worth remembering that this is the only part of the

qualification which focuses on AO4 which requires candidates to analyse and evaluate interpretations, explaining how and why they differ. These differences may be conveyed in a variety of different ways, including language and tone, selection of information and points of emphasis, dependent upon the specific interpretations provided. Further information may be found in *Getting Started* p **43**, 45, 47-9.

The existence of the strands which make up AO4 leads to 'best-fit marking'. All strands are considered before a final mark is decided upon. The most successful candidates, therefore were able to display evidence of a clear understanding of all 3.

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the problems faced by the Provisional Government?

Explain your answer, using both interpretations and your knowledge of the historical context.

(16)

I agree with interpretation 2's views that are being displayed here. The war was a big issue for Russia, as they already faced many economic problems, as well as the events such as strikes back home. The Provisional Government wanted to stay involved in the war as they ~~needed~~ needed support, resources and money from the other countries. However, the people of Russia could see how the problems such as money were not getting solved by continuing to fight, as the money would have mainly been put towards the war, for buying machinery and weaponry. Because of this issue, more and more soviets were wanting to cause an uprising, and they also formed many new political groups to overthrow the Provisional Government. By having little support and help from the people of Russia, their position was getting more and more vulnerable everyday, and the threat of them being overthrown was becoming more likely. However, they didn't change their decision, and it wasn't until Lenin's ~~1917~~

leadership and the treaty of Brest Litovsk that Russia were finally out of the war.

~~I also agree with this point as they were putting most of their attention on the war, and not~~

I also agree as because of Russia's weak state which they were in, the likely hood of invasion was becoming a big issue. If Germany and the fellow enemies decided to attack Russia then they were in no state to defend it or protect their land. If this did happen, it would be blamed on the ~~provis~~ Provisional Government as they were the officials in charge. After the Tsar's poor leadership in the years past, the ~~pr~~ Provisional Government needed to make amends in the war, and the steps in which they were taking was seen as a bad move from most people who would suffer the consequences if something does go wrong.

However, I also disagree with the interpretation, as although these issues were taking place in the war against Germany, there were also major issues that the Provisional Government

faced back in their own country, such as rebellions. The Provisional Government was set up after the Tsar had abdicated, and it was left to the Duma to elect a new government. This was not what the people wanted, as they wanted to choose their own leader, which is why when someone like Lenin came with his slogan 'Peace, Bread and Land', people took a liking to him. An example of a rebellion would be the 'storming of the Winter Palace', which was when the Provisional Government was finally overthrown. This was suspected throughout the whole process, as the Provisional Government's actions leading up to this point were all seen as wrong.

In conclusion, I do agree with the interpretation, but I also believe that there are other points which also proved to be problems that the Provisional Government faced. It was evident that they would eventually be overthrown, and this was all because of the mistakes and actions taken leading up to this point.



The candidate does provide valid evaluative comment to agree with the interpretation. They also make use of Interpretation 2 and analyse some of the points using relevant contextual knowledge. The inclusion of contextual knowledge is a strength of this answer. However no reference is made to Interpretation 1 at all. The best fit mark for this candidate is therefore low Level 3.



Both interpretations need to be analysed in order to gain a mark above Level 1 for strand 2 of AO4, analysis of interpretations.

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the problems faced by the Provisional Government?

Explain your answer, using both interpretations and your knowledge of the historical context.

(16)

I agree to some extent with Interpretation 2 that the main problem faced by the Provisional Government was the distraction of the war with Germany. ~~As~~ However, I also must agree with Interpretation 1 that 'Order Number 1' had an important effect on the Provisional Government, leading to many problems. On the other hand, both interpretations fail to mention other important problems caused by the Kornilov Revolt and failure to hold a general election.

Agreeing with Interpretation 2, the war had many knock-on effects for the Provisional Government causing ~~the~~ them many problems. ~~As mentioned~~, The strains and toll of the war drained resources from ^{Russia} ~~the Provisional Government~~ such as grain (in order to feed the ~~the~~ army) causing food shortages and overall discontent from workers and peasants alike, reducing popular support for the Provisional Government. As mentioned in Interpretation 2, the war was also a distraction for the government from dealing with 'severe social and economic problems' such as unrest, discontent, poor living and working conditions in cities.

as well as backward farming. This again decreased support for the Provisional Government, ~~and~~ and also forced those in power to neglect important issues internally, ~~and~~ creating a problem of unpopularity which was an important factor in the downfall of the Provisional Government on the 25th of October 1917. Therefore, there is a strong argument that the war ~~event~~ contributed to most of the problems of the Provisional Government.

Disagreeing with Interpretation 2, there is an equally strong argument that 'Order Number 1' was the main problem of the Provisional Government. This order ~~is~~ undermined its power, caused loss of respect and authority and led to the problem of the unlimited authority of the Petrograd Soviet against the Provisional Government. As mentioned in Interpretation 1, this lost the Provisional Government control over the 'railways', 'postal and telegraph services' and 'all military action' which left the government very vulnerable (as shown in the storming of the Winter Palace) ~~and~~ and their existence was in the hands of the Soviet. Therefore, there is also a strong argument that the Petrograd Soviet was the source of most of the Provisional Government's problems during 1917.

~~So~~ There are many ~~and~~ ~~rather~~ slightly weaker

arguments disagreeing with Interpretation 2 such as the Kornilov Revolt. This revolt failed in August 1917 however it reflected badly on Kerensky (head of the Provisional Government and also a member of the Petrograd soviet) as he was thought to have been aware of Kornilov's plans. The effect of this was shedding light on the weaknesses of the Provisional Government and inspired doubt in its leader, Kerensky. Another ~~or~~ problem was the lack of legitimacy of the Provisional Government. Its purpose was established to be a temporary solution after the abdication of ~~the~~ Tsar Nicholas II until they could hold a general election. The failure to hold this election decreased ~~legitimacy~~ legitimacy and respect and also caused a surge of support for the Bolsheviks as a byproduct. ~~Therefore there are many~~

In conclusion, I partly agree with Interpretation 2 that the war was the main problem faced by the Provisional Government in 1917 as it caused discontent however I think 'Order Number 1' as ^{an} equally important problem as it undermined government authority and caused lack of power. There were other problems too but these are the strongest arguments for the main problem faced.



This candidate reviews the alternative views presented in the interpretations and comes to a substantiated conclusion. Contextual knowledge is used to support the analysis and there is a clear line of reasoning throughout. All aspects of Level 4 are met and the analysis of the interpretations is very precise. This answer is clearly Level 4.



Candidates who examine precise details from the interpretations and then use their own knowledge to support these points are more likely to gain the higher levels.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance in this exam, candidates are offered the following advice:

- When asked to make inferences in Q1 make sure that the inferences are relevant to the specified enquiry
- In Q3(a) focus on linking the provenance to the content of the sources
- When analysing the reasons for the different views in the interpretations focus on their content – candidates should not be concerned with the book title, the author or the type of publication
- In Q3(d) candidates must review the alternative views in both interpretations as well as using specific knowledge to support the points made
- All the sub-questions in Q3 should be seen as part of the same enquiry with each question guiding candidates towards the final analysis in Q3(d)

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>

