



Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

November 2020

Pearson Edexcel GCSE

In History (1HI0)

Paper 30: Modern depth study (1HI0)

Option 30: Russia and the Soviet Union, 1917–
41

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

November 2020

Publications Code 1HI0_30_pef_20210211

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2020

PE Report Paper 10

Introduction

Due to the special circumstances in which candidates sat the November series papers the entry for this paper was much smaller than usual. This means that lessons learned from this series reflect the outcomes for this small candidature and may not accurately reflect patterns and trends for a larger cohort. Therefore, in seeking further understanding of how the marking operates on this paper it is recommended that interested parties also read the reports from Summers 2018 and 2019.

It was noted in the 2018 and 2019 reports that candidates were well prepared for this unit. Although candidates appeared to have been well prepared on the specification, there were fewer examples of the wide-ranging knowledge seen in previous series. Despite seeing some good knowledge and understanding of the period fewer candidates than in previous series were able to precisely select material to address questions directly. Candidates appeared to be reasonably comfortable in dealing with a range of political, economic and social aspects of the period. Candidates were generally well prepared for the question styles and there was evidence of good understanding of the demands of all questions.

The Modern World Depth Studies are designed to encourage students 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 conditions for workers in towns in the Soviet Union in the years 1928–41. 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, analyse the different views presented in the interpretations and the reasons for those differences, and are then invited to judge the extent to which they agree with one of the interpretations. Because of the specific focus in Section B, the questions in Section A are designed to explore other areas of the specification which are not covered in B.

In question 1 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 question 2, 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 no marks were available to reward this evaluation, however strongly argued. 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. This does not mean candidates need to identify three different causes or events. It was pleasing to see that candidates had understood this expectation and most answers were clearly structured in paragraphs, making it easy for the examiner to identify the different aspects being covered.

All of the sub-questions in Section B relate to either the two interpretations, Sources B and C, or both the sources and interpretations. Question 3 (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 3 (a) candidates are expected to evaluate the usefulness of the content, taking account of the provenance of the sources and applying contextual knowledge in making judgements about the utility of the sources as evidence for the specific enquiry in the question. These strands are linked and should be dealt with together, rather than in isolation. There is no need to compare the two sources and, indeed, only a handful of students did attempt to do this.

Questions 3(b) and 3(c) examine the views expressed in the two provided interpretations. It should be recognised that the interpretations offer alternative views but do not necessarily conflict with each other. Candidates are expected to identify the main difference between the views in 3(b) and use the interpretations to support those claims. This question was generally well done and most candidates who were able to show how the interpretations differed, could also support their answers with direct references to, or examples taken from the interpretations. The focus in 3(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 3c below).

Question 3 (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 3(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 3(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 knowledge of aspects of the topic which the candidate has revised but are not relevant to the enquiry. There were fewer high quality answers to this question than in previous series although most candidates dealt comfortably with the interpretations, taking a range of approaches. However, this question was accessible to all candidates and even those who did not score highly understood the need to offer evaluative responses leading to an overall conclusion. Spelling, punctuation and grammar were assessed on 3(d).

Question 1

In question 1 candidates were invited to make inferences about the Bolshevik supporters during the seizure of power in October 1917. There were two marks available for each valid 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 hatred the Bolsheviks had for the Tsars which could be referenced by the slashing of the pictures. A small minority of candidates made appropriate inferences which were not appropriately supported.

- 1 Give **two** things you can infer from Source A about the Bolshevik supporters during the seizure of power in October 1917.

Complete the table below to explain your answer.

(i) What I can infer:

There was deep resentment/anger towards the
Tsarist rule

Details in the source that tell me this:

Bolshevik supporters who are wrecking the
paintings of the tsars.

(ii) What I can infer:

Good organisation ~~and~~ within the Bolshevik army

Details in the source that tell me this:

Every soldier has a weapon, is wearing uniforms to
label their positions/rank, has a red cloth on their
left arms.

This candidate has made two valid inferences about the Bolshevik supporters by direct reference to the source, so gains full marks.

Question 2

Candidates performed reasonably well on this question and 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 the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk as a reason for the Civil War. There was a clear understanding of what the Treaty and the anger this caused amongst a range of groups. Many candidates referred to the Czech legion, though few were able to articulate clearly the role of the legion in starting the Civil War. Many candidates were also able to discuss the range of political opposition to the Bolsheviks both inside and outside of Russia, though this knowledge was not always effectively used to explain the reasons for the Civil War. There were a number of candidates who clearly focused on the question throughout and provided aspects of content beyond those in the stimulus to aid their causal explanation.

Less successful candidates were able to describe the various problems facing Russia, but were unable to explain how these problems connected to the outbreak of Civil War.

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 are not expected to prioritise or link factors in this question and it is not rewarded in the markscheme at any level. In cases where candidates did prioritise factors, examiners were 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 opposition groups within Russia or the actions of the Czech legion 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. Many answers at levels 2 and 3 tended to discuss issues which were causes of general discontent rather than specific causes of revolution in February 1917. At Level 4 there were some sustained analytical responses supported by well-chosen examples which displayed clear understanding of the precise question.

Overall, candidates were very comfortable with this style of question.

Example

2 Explain why the Civil War broke out in 1918.

(12)

You may use the following in your answer:

- Czech Legion
- Treaty of Brest-Litovsk

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

The Civil War broke out due to the harsh and unfair agreements of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. For example, the Russians wanted to exit out of W.W.I which was deeply unpopular with the Russian people which was one of the main factors behind the revolution. The Russians made peace with the central powers in exchange for giving up their territories such as Finland and Estonia to the central powers. The Russians lost 1 million square miles, 1 third of their population and most of their iron, coal and natural resource stores along with their heavy industry.

As a result it worsened and weakened the economy even further and put many jobs at risk the Bolsheviks were meant to protect which caused their reputation and favour to drastically fall.

Therefore the harsh terms disfavoured and humiliated the Russian people even though they tried to resist the treaty by force which further embarrassed the Russian people. This became a driven factor towards the civil war since the Bolsheviks failed greatly.

Secondly it has to do with Lenin dissolving the Duma and enforcing Bolshevik rule. For example Russia was meant to have it's first free elections in the Duma. The Bolsheviks were only able to win around a hundred seats while the Socialist Revolutionary party won around 300 winning the election. It was out of 703 votes. This election defeat greatly angered Lenin who ordered his Red guards to dissolve the Duma and to fire upon those who would resist.

As a result Lenin placed himself and his party as the legitimate government of Russia and started to ban other political parties. He would ~~undo~~ unravel all the progress the Russian people have progressed and fought for. This caused the opposition to form a armed resistance organisation known as the White Army. It was comprised of Monarchists, former officers of the Tsar and Anti Lenin and Bolshevik Socialists.

Therefore Lenins actions sparked a violent resistance due to Lenin dissolving the Duma and ruining the elections. While the white army had many different agendas they all desired to remove Lenin from power by force which resulted in the civil war.

Thirdly there were some who still desired to return Russia back into a autocracy when the tsars were ruling.

For example there ~~have~~ the white army was comprised of many monarchists who wanted to prevent the execution of the tsar since he was under house rest with his entire family. At this point for the first time Romanov rule came to a end which lasted for 200 yrs and during that time they were important religious and national figureheads. The death / execution of the tsar caused shock all across Europe as Lenin feared the Romanovs could take advantage of the brewing situation. AS a result of the tsars imprisonment many of his supporters wish to rescue him including former officers of his army who were given power positions thanks to the tsar.

Therefore the civil war was partly motivated by the monarchists desire to re instate and rescue the Romanovs "since they were of the tsar was due for the death penalty which was originally intended by the duo when he abdicated."

(Total for Question 2 = 12 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 16 MARKS

Examiner comment:

The candidate has covered three areas of content and has, therefore, satisfied the requirements for higher marks in Assessment Objective 1 to go beyond the stimulus points and to show wide-ranging knowledge. The quality of analysis also meets the demands of the markscheme for Assessment Objective 2. The candidate achieved a Level 4 mark for both Assessment Objectives.

Question 3a

This was probably the question where candidates' performance was most unbalanced and few managed to display the analysis required to reach L3. Although many answers consisted of thoughtful comments about the content of the sources, there are three strands to the markscheme that all need to be addressed. 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 conditions for workers in towns in the Soviet Union in the years 1928–41. 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 criterion do not fully consider the value of the sources as evidence

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 a British communist, Freda Uteley, and being an outsider could make her more objective. They also pointed out that Freda Uteley was a member of the Communist party and so might be biased in favour of the improvements in living conditions under the Bolsheviks. Many candidates then used bits of the source which showed Uteley criticising the working conditions without trying to explain why she would do this if, as already stated, she supported communism. Only a small number of candidates effectively utilised the provenance to establish that the content of the source could be useful, precisely because it was a critical comment from a sympathetic outsider.

It was disappointing to see the number of generic responses commenting on the provenance of the sources. 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.

Many answers made good use of contextual knowledge but some well-prepared candidates spent too much time talking about living conditions 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.

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, 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. Please note that accuracy and reliability are different criteria.

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. Very few candidates tried to do this. Candidates who use this approach should ensure that they come to a judgement about the utility of each source within the response. The focus of the question is usefulness of the individual sources.

SECTION B

For this section, you will need to use the sources and interpretations in the Sources/Interpretations Booklet.

3 (a) Study Sources B and C.

How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into conditions for workers in towns in the Soviet Union in the years 1928–41?

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

(8)

Sources B and C vary in usefulness regarding a clear and ~~not~~ uninfluenced enquiry into the conditions for workers in the Soviet Union in the years 1928–41. This is due to the speakers behind the claims in the sources. Source B comes from Stalin's speech made to the Communist Party Central Committee in 1938. Stalin was notorious for his use of propaganda in ~~both~~ his speeches and ^{the} media reporting on his speeches. This calls into question his claims about positive changes to workers' rights and quality of life in factories. While it is true that unemployment, in source B's claims, had been "abolished", this was ~~due~~ because of workers being forced on to collectivised farms and pressure from Stalin's ^{police} ~~people~~ on the ordinary worker to ~~see~~ accept their roles in life and work for incremental amounts of

pay. The accuracy of Stalin's statement "nobody can doubt the progress we have made" is questionable, as while there had certainly been improvement, the reason why nobody could doubt said progress is because Stalin would've had the secret police shoot said doubters or put them in camps.

Source C, on the other hand, could be understood and perhaps used as more factually or at least interpretationally correct information, as the extract comes from Freda Uhlery's *Lost Illusion*. Uhlery ~~was~~ ^{is} a member of the communist party, would have nothing to gain from publishing details regarding the more brutal effects of Stalin's regime to industrialise. By reporting on what she witnessed with her own eyes, there is a clear look ~~at~~ given into an enquiry on what life was like for the worker under Stalin. "Workers had lost all freedom and human rights" is her ^{overall} statement regarding the reportedly "improved" state Stalin talked of in source B. This is in ~~it~~ direct contrast to source B, where an optimistic outlook was given. It is my opinion that source B ~~is~~ ^{may} well be a more useful enquiry into the ~~life~~ ^{lives} of workers.

Examiner comment:

This candidate has evaluated the utility of source B effectively, making judgements which apply the provenance of the source, and their own knowledge to evaluate the content. When looking at source C the candidate makes good points on the provenance, but lacks sufficient contextual knowledge to test the source. The candidate therefore achieved a mark of 6. Source B was marked at level 3 and Source C at level 2.

Question 3b

In this question candidates are expected to identify the main difference between the views presented in Interpretations 1 and 2. In this case the interpretations provided different views about the conditions for workers in towns in the Soviet Union in the years 1928–41. In order to access Level 2 marks candidates are expected to provide some support from the given interpretations which many did in the form of well-chosen, short quotations. It should be noted that the interpretations do not necessarily offer contrasting views, merely different views.

It is important for candidates to remember that the focus of this question is to identify the differences between the views rather than identifying differences of surface detail as the latter can only be awarded marks in Level 1. Responses which asserted differences without support, for example stating that Interpretation 1 emphasises the negative aspects of the conditions in the towns, whereas Interpretation 2 emphasises the improvements made in living conditions, 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. Many candidates were able to score full marks.

Examples

(b) Study Interpretations 1 and 2. They give different views about conditions for workers in towns in the Soviet Union in the years 1928–41.

What is the main difference between these views?

Explain your answer, using details from both interpretations.

(4)

The main difference between these views is that Interpretation 1 details the suffering and poverty workers were subject to, whereas Interpretation 2 describes conditions as improving, and even 'good'. Interpretation 1 portrays conditions for workers as hopeless, shown in 'demands for better pay and conditions were seen as being selfish'; this shows the stagnancy of workers' ability lacking social mobility and room for improvement offered to the workers. This greatly contrasts with Interpretation 2's statement that 'more workers were able to become managers'.

Examiner comment

This answer clearly states the main difference of view between the interpretations and supports this with extracts from the interpretations and as a result gets full marks.

Question 3c

There was a limited understanding of the demands of this question this year and few candidates were able to provide convincing explanations why the interpretations may differ. The majority of candidates gaining marks at Level 2 explained that the historians might have relied on different types of sources in forming their opinions and, used Sources B and C to support this explanation. Other candidates were able to access Level 2 by clearly explaining how, for example, the authors had chosen to assess / approach living standards from different perspectives. In order to gain marks at Level 2 it is also essential that the explanation is substantiated effectively and this might be based on information taken from either the sources or the interpretations themselves depending on the approach taken.

In trying to give an explanation for a reason for difference between interpretations some candidates are still attempting to use the provenance of the interpretations to provide this explanation and this is unlikely to provide a valid basis for a response to this question. The full reasons for this are explained in the *Getting Started Guide* on pp 43-44. As stated in *Getting Started*: 'Students should distinguish between their comments on contemporary sources and on these texts. Responses based on matters such as the origin or time of production of these secondary works are unlikely to be valid for this question.' A significant number of candidates did try to provide explanations for difference on the basis of such factors as the titles of the books, their origin or date of production.

(c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about conditions for workers in towns in the Soviet Union in the years 1928–41.

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

(4)

One reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 differ concerning conditions of workers in towns is that I1 is concerned with the social aspect of policy whereas I2 is concerned with the political aspect of policy.

I2 mention 'competition' for jobs and to be the most effective workers and, politically, this is a successful method by which progress can be achieved but I1, when discussing 'workers' rights' and selfishness, focuses on those who were unable to succeed in the meritocracy of Soviet industrial policy.

Thus, as they discuss different groups of workers, they must fundamentally give different views.

Examiner comment

This candidate has gained full marks by explaining how the writers have taken different approaches to analysing living standards. They have evidenced the validity of this by quoting from the interpretations and therefore receives full marks.

Question 3d

Examiners were very pleased to read many responses to this question which consisted of clear attempts to evaluate the different views about the living standards in towns and cities presented in the two interpretations and that these answers were well focused on the AO4 target for this question, namely the analysis and evaluation of interpretations. These views are not intended to illustrate a controversy. This is the only time candidates will be tested on AO4: Analysis and evaluation of interpretations. The overall quality of a response to this question is determined by reference to the three strands presented in the mark scheme:

- the quality of the judgement based on reasoning
- the analysis of the provided material
- the deployment of knowledge of the historical context to support the application of criteria.

The second strand of A04 requires an analysis of the Interpretations. In order to be successful candidates needed to correctly identify a valid point of view presented in Interpretation 2, in this case that living conditions in towns and cities were good. Pleasingly most candidates were able to do this, identifying the gist of the interpretation clearly. Less successful candidates showed an awareness of the gist 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.

Although some candidates produced responses which were solely based on the consideration of one interpretation, which limited the candidate's performance particularly on the second strand (analysis of the provided material), most candidates were able to establish some form of discussion based on the different views which they had established in 3(b).

Many candidates produced responses which considered the view presented in Interpretation 2 and then contrasted it with the view given in Interpretation 1 and this structure produced some good responses. Some candidates looked to compare the different views directly and used both interpretations throughout the response and this was often used to very good effect. At Level 4 candidates are expected to demonstrate precise analysis of the interpretations indicating how the differences of view are conveyed. Candidates who successfully met this element of the mark scheme could do so in a range of different ways but those candidates who examined the different points of emphasis in the two interpretations were often able to make a very convincing case; others were able to examine how the selection of information in the two interpretations influenced the views presented. There is additional guidance provided in *Getting Started* pp43, 45 and 47-9.

The selection of contextual knowledge to support the evaluation was often a strong aspect of candidates' responses with most candidates showing a good awareness of how to deploy their knowledge as well as being in possession of an appropriate level of detail. It was pleasing to note that there were very few responses which focused primarily on providing contextual knowledge for its own sake and that candidates showed an awareness of how to use their knowledge to help them decide on the validity of views selected from the interpretations. A small number of candidates were unable to apply their own knowledge effectively. 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.

It is expected that candidates will reach a judgement when answering this question and the strongest candidates developed their evaluation throughout the answer, creating a

consistently argued evaluation. Less successful answers offered points to support the views expressed in Interpretation 2, then used Interpretation 1 to challenge those views, before reaching the view that Interpretation 2 was 'somewhat accurate' or saying that they 'partially agreed' with the view.

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.

In addition, most candidates were able to provide full and structured responses with very few appearing to be rushed or running out of time.

Spelling, punctuation, grammar and use of specialist terminology will be assessed in part (d).

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about conditions for workers in towns in the Soviet Union in the years 1928-41?

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

(16)

Conditions for workers in towns in the Soviet Union in the years 1928 to 41 were, in fact, very tough and harsh. I will be writing whether I agree with Interpretation 2 or the other which is completely agreed to Interpretation 1.

Interpretation 2 focuses on the positive aspects of working conditions. How the USSR generated pay for some jobs, rewards with promotion to efficient workers and better living and housing. Overall good and better conditions for town workers. However, this is what ~~the~~ Stalin and the ~~USSR~~ communist party had intended conditions to be given industrialisation. With Stalin rapid industrialisation policies such as the three 5 year plans, this did mean there were more opportunities for workers in towns, as there was a huge increase in jobs that had to be done to achieve industrialisation. However, initially this as it meant positive opportunities for the job is far from the truth. As we know that conditions were in fact terrible and there wasn't any opportunity for to better lifestyles. Just long, unrelaxing, harsh conditions for those jobs. As this interpretation ~~was~~ written in 2015, over fifty years later, the internet, the way

have based this on my be a government proposal
or central piece of legislation as a law proposal
and consistency is not a lot during Stalin's reign of power.
The Interplan is what Stalin did to convert policy into
~~plans~~ codes to look like to the future, how
well to compare. oppose articles to study further than
our selfish goals of industrializing the Soviet Union
for the masses. To simply put, I ~~disagree~~ disagree
completely with the Interplan data to leaders just
works as it is bad ~~off~~ at work from a long
time ago it actually happened and has been passing
and likelihood of being based off of historical, second hand
time sources.

However, interpretation I show the true display of
what conditions would have looked like at the time. ~~in 1929-1933~~
in 1929-1933, it was exactly what they had the IT
shows what we know today about the harsh treatment
of conditions for the workers. How they had in overwork
conditions, harsh ~~conditions~~ housing. How the "apparatus" that
Stalin gave were actually a takeover of workers rights and
freedom. To keep up with the industrial plan (5 year
plan) that had those things, we know that the had
to be huge amounts of work done, to the point where
workers had to suffer in order to achieve this.

This is correct as we know now that workers are the
line but to reach a set target is what's missing
they were in. Failure to do so could lead to unexpected and
harsh treatment from the current policy government. I agree
with Interpretation 1 as not only does it make logical
sense but the goals and objectives of the situation that
pays are in line with the general conditions that we know
they were put there.

More time to what I agree we interpret 1 is what
both interpretations fail to take about. The stakeholder meant,
A set up plan by the government to encourage all
workers to get into the land of a worker, stakeholder also
had supported actual work to this by target. Encouraging others to
our goal for target too as they saw treatment of the
high standards as getting, achieving and needed and
getting put on television news. However, we know now that
this was a set up and the high goal was against other
workers with lots of help from other workers - duty to
encourage others to work better. We can see that to
that we think the process of lying and deceiving; the
government tried to make people reach target, giving us
reason to say Interpretation 2 that says "work pay" was more
less strict" and "not using cashing out". Interpretation
1 that says "strict by hand, checks for the pay of

Conditions as "Selfish" is not seen in the text
The evidence that we know today.

In conclusion, I compare disagree with interpret 2, saying
how it looks on what should have been the case
for conditions of what the source can and be what
works to feel and say and agree with interprets 1
what else what conditions would have been like
makes logical sense, but ~~it~~ it off real good, extra
as it is in line/true with it.

Examiner comment

The candidate analyses both interpretations and uses contextual knowledge to discuss them. At times the answer loses focus and begins to evaluate the reliability of the interpretations, which is not required. An overall judgement is given with a generally sustained line of reasoning. The candidate received a mark of L3 10.

Conclusion

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

- When asked to make inferences in question 1 make sure that the inferences are based on the content of the source
- In question 3(a) focus on using the provenance and also contextual knowledge to evaluate the usefulness of 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, date, the author or the type of publication
- In question 3(d) candidates must review the alternative views in both interpretations as well as using specific contextual knowledge to support the points made
- All the sub-questions in question 3 should be seen as part of the same enquiry with each question guiding candidates towards the final analysis in 3(d).