

Examiners' Report  
June 2016

GCE History 8H10 1E

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

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



### 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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2016

Publications Code 8HI0\_1E\_1606\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

## Introduction

It was pleasing to see responses of a decent standard from candidates attempting the new AS Paper 1C which covers *Russia, 1917-91: from Lenin to Yeltsin*.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A and Section B contain a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in breadth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts - cause, consequence, change/ continuity, similarity/difference and significance. Section C contains one compulsory question that assesses the ability to analyse and evaluate historical interpretations (AO3) concerning the fall of the USSR, c.1985-91. Candidates have to answer three questions – one from each Section.

Generally speaking, candidates found Section C more challenging mainly because some of them were not entirely clear about how to analyse and evaluate the extracts they were presented with.

Moreover, the detailed knowledge base required in Section C to add contextual material to support/challenge points derived from the extracts was also often absent. Having said this, although a few responses were quite brief, there was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer questions from Sections A, B or C. The ability range was wide, but the design of the paper allowed all abilities to be catered for. Furthermore, in Sections A and B, few candidates produced wholly descriptive essays which were devoid of analysis and, for the most part, responses were soundly structured. The most common weakness in Section A and B essays was a lack of knowledge. It is important to realise that Section A and Section B questions may be set from any part of any of the four Themes, and, as a result, full coverage of the specification is enormously important.

The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

## **Question 1**

On Question 1, stronger responses targeted the reasons for the Soviet regime's control over its people in the years 1917-53 and included an analysis of links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (causation). Sufficient knowledge was used to develop the stated factor (state propaganda) and a range of other factors (e.g. Soviet use of terror, persecution of religious beliefs/practices and the galvanising effect of victory in the Second World War). Judgements made about the relative importance of state propaganda were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of the reasons for the Soviet regime's control over its people in the years 1917-53. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on causation or were essentially a narrative of the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far (e.g. one aspect of state propaganda). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Yes	No
Newspapers ✓	Terror ✓
Radio ✓	<del>Abolition of</del>
Agit-Prop ✓	Collectivisation ✓
<del>Censorship</del>	<del>Churches</del>
<del>Cult of personality</del>	Churches-Culture

The government of the USSR used a variety of methods in order to assert their control over the people with propaganda being implemented from the October Revolution, however there were also many other methods which were used to great effect.

In many ways propaganda was the main way the Communists asserted control 1957 - 53. Firstly, when the Communists came to power in 1917 they were a small party of 300,000 members, because of this they had to portray the revolution as the rising up of the workers. They achieved this image of mass support in many ways. Firstly in November 1917 all non-Socialist newspapers were banned, being expanded to all non-Bolshevik newspapers in 1921, this meant the only available news sources for the people were the Party newspaper (Pravda) and the state newspapers. This meant that all the information they were being fed took the form of supporting the Communist regime, thus meaning that people were far more likely to support the Bolsheviks as they saw them as highly successful leaders. Additionally, the radio was a relatively new invention, with the revolution being broadcast in Morse Code, however by 1921 the Party had ~~many~~ its own radio station, broadcasting via loudspeakers installed in the

(Section A continued) street, this was a successful method of propaganda because it meant that the party was able to reach its cause to the 65% of the population who were illiterate, thus making the use of propaganda an essential tool in passing the Bolshevik method to the Soviet people. The highly illiterate population also led to the creation of agitation propaganda teams during the 1920s as a method of getting the Bolshevik message to the rural areas of the USSR, these included political plays and performances convincing the peasants of the benefits of Socialism.

Additionally, under Stalin a vast 'Cult of Personality' developed in which Stalin was portrayed by propaganda as a close ally of Lenin in the early years of the Union, as well as depicting a 'great role' he played in the October Revolution, this led to a frenzy of support from the Soviet people that Stalin had been 'chosen by God' or was in fact a god-like figure himself leading to deification of him as a figure, this shows effective methods of control as the people supported and loved their leader so much that they wouldn't possibly imagine rebelling against him, this was shown in 1953 after Stalin's death when people were genuinely weeping in the streets simply from remorse at the news - evidence of a completely indoctrinated society, which had been achieved by cleverly planned propaganda campaigns.

However, other methods of control were also implemented suggesting that the use of propaganda was not the main method of control. Firstly, right from the beginning the Party implemented mass terror upon the population with the formation of the

(Section A continued) Cheka in December 1917, the secret police was mobilised to maintain control on a grand scale by Stalin, during dekulakisation in the early 1930s Stalin used the Secret Police to denounce the kulaks (rich peasants) as a class, ~~and~~ with the secret police arresting thousands of people who resisted the policy, this showed asserted control as it completely eliminated potential opposition to the collectivisation process, meaning the party had ~~no~~ no boundaries to enforcing their will upon the people.

Additionally, the economic policies / systems put in place also gave the party more control over the people, for example the policy of forced collectivisation saw 93% of households in collective farms by 1937, these collective farms were run directly by the state, who provided medicine and machinery for their work, this meant that almost all of the rural population were dependant upon the party structures in order to work, therefore meaning the party had control over the people because they had no choice but to accept the policy of collectivisation or be taken away by the secret police, also by having mass collectives of farms rather than individual plots it made it easier for the party to assert power over a large number of people.

Furthermore, the government's control of the arts and culture also played a large role in controlling Soviet people's lives. Policies such as socialist realism under Stalin saw traditional images and art forms return to the lives of Soviet

(Section A continued) people. This was an important factor in maintaining control during WWII where films such as 'Alexander' displayed images of heroism in the name of the Russian nation, this meant that patriotism was built by the war in order to fight for the country - rather than for the Party - meaning that the people would be united, but still supporting the cause the Communist party wishes. Additionally, in post war Russia, such as the years leading up to Stalin's death in the early 1950s, the Party was able to redirect the unity of the Russian people in order to carry out its wishes for reconstruction in the 4<sup>th</sup> Five Year plan 1946-50, this shows the party had control over the people through more assertive methods than propaganda as the people simply agreed and carried out the demands, especially in newly acquired Eastern European countries who were completely against Communist control, demanding therefore the Communist asserted terror upon them, such as the Mingrelian Affair 1951 where Stalin eliminated rebellious ethnicity of people who threatened his control and position.

In conclusion, propaganda was an essential tool in maintaining control for the Communist Party, especially in its early years after the revolution, however I disagree that it is the main reason for maintaining Communist control as it was not enough to just push Communist ideology to encourage policies such as collectivisation forward, for that terror was needed, which therefore shows that the Communist government would have been unable to implement policies without other methods of control, and thus



(Section A continued) propaganda was not the main reason for the Communist government maintaining control 1917-53.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response was placed at the top of Level 4 because it (1) offers a strong analysis of the reasons for the Soviet regime's control over its people in the years 1917-53 and has a good focus on causation; (2) in-depth knowledge is used to develop the stated factor (state propaganda) and other factors (mass terror, economic policy and official control of the arts and culture) and (3) an overall judgement is reached in the conclusion based on the key criteria (the effectiveness of state propaganda and state coercion) developed in the main analysis.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Be sure that you are able to make a logical judgement about the relative importance of the stated factor named in the question when set against your other factors.

## **Question 2**

On Question 2, stronger responses targeted the reasons for the Soviet regime's growing political stagnation in the years 1964-82 and included an analysis of links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (causation). Sufficient knowledge was used to develop the stated factor (Khrushchev's limited reform of the Soviet government) and a range of other factors (e.g. Brezhnev's reversal of several of his predecessor's reforms and Brezhnev's failure to deal with the Stalinist legacy). Judgements made about the relative importance of Khrushchev's limited reform of the Soviet government were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of the reasons for the Soviet regime's growing political stagnation in the years 1964-82. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on causation or were essentially a political narrative of the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far (e.g. one aspect of Khrushchev's reforms). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Chosen question number: Question 1  Question 2  X

~~Khrushchev was dismissed from the party in 1964, after his reforms seemed to be challenging~~

Khrushchev's limited reforms led him to being sacked in the years to 1964-82. His secret speech shocked many as he publicly denounced Stalin in front of many and his actions and then carried out de-Stalinisation. This included reducing the amount of terror used and reducing the power of the secret police. Also releasing prisoners from labor camps however only four percent returned back to normal civilian life after being released. When Khrushchev's reforms challenged the power of those in the party Khrushchev was asked to be removed in 1957, this was to be decided by the central party, however this was rejected but again when his reforms started to challenge them again he was removed in 1964. Taking his place was Leonid Brezhnev, who relied on others, promoted his friends to higher parts of the party forming an oligarchy. It will be argued that Brezhnev who succeeded Khrushchev was to blame for political stagnation.

When Brezhnev succeeded Khrushchev he went about undoing the <sup>majority</sup> ~~reforms~~ of Khrushchev's reforms however he too still did not use the terror that Stalin had used from 1928 to 53. Instead Brezhnev gave ~~himself~~ himself rewards such as the Lenin peace prize in

(Section A continued) order to make himself seem as though he was a great leader he dined in himself on fine things to the point where his mother asks 'what will you do if the kulshenks return?' he had minimal influence and often relied on others in the party for there were some of the factors contributing to political stagnation.

Another issue regarding Brezhnev was that he had put his friends at higher positions within the party forming an oligarchy (an elite of small group of elites ruling out of self interest) as of course he was surrounded by friends it is clear that Brezhnev faced little opposition although he did do much and pretty much continued where others had left off and if things were a problem he'd remove like he did with Khrushchev's reforms to avoid enemies within the party. Hence how there was a growing political stagnation and not much change within the party.

Overall, it is clear the Khrushchev's reforms were not the main reason to political stagnation as although they didn't change much as the party structure created under Stalin had been so entrenched it was difficult to change it is fair to say the main problem was Brezhnev and his little to no attempt of reform but instead his reluctant behaviour and having others deal with major issues with the party clearly was the problem.



**ResultsPlus**  
**Examiner Comments**

This Level 2 response exhibits many of the shortcomings of lower scoring answers (1) it offers limited analysis of the reasons for the Soviet regime's growing political stagnation in the years 1964-82; (2) the candidate's own knowledge lacks range and depth (e.g. very little is offered on Khrushchev's reforms); (3) although there is some focus on causation some sections are essentially descriptive and (4) an overall judgement is given but because of the limitations noted above it lacks proper substantiation.



**ResultsPlus**  
**Examiner Tip**

If you use the key phrases from the question throughout your essay, this will help you to write a relevant analytical response.

### **Question 3**

On Question 3, stronger responses targeted how far the priorities for Soviet industry and agriculture changed in the years 1953-85. These also included an analysis of relationships between key issues and a focus on the concept (change/continuity) in the question. Sufficient knowledge to develop the argument was demonstrated too (e.g. attempts to broaden the Soviet economy under the Seven Year Plan, Khrushchev's Virgin Lands scheme, the conservative influence of the Soviet military-industrial complex, and the short-lived Kosygin reforms). Judgements made about the extent of change and continuity in Soviet industrial and agricultural priorities were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of the extent to which the priorities for Soviet industry and agriculture changed in the years 1953-85. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on change/continuity or were essentially a description of Soviet agricultural and industrial policies during the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (e.g. only considering Khrushchev's industrial/agricultural priorities or the influence of the Soviet military-industrial complex). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Plan: priorities of Soviet industry + agriculture 1953-1985

Did change

→ Khrushchev

- Change → Ag → virgin land
- Ind. less control

No change

→ K + B

- Innovation
- Consumer goods

Brezhnev

→ stability → Ag → reform  
Kosygin (rejected)

- Max military (15% 70's)
- Technology

---

In the years 1953 to 1985, the leaders of the Soviet Union had to somehow progress the old fashioned industrial economy created by Stalin between 1928 to 1953. However, they had different priorities when doing this. Khrushchev (1953 to 1963) wanted as much change and reform as possible. However Brezhnev and Andropov (1963 to 1985) wanted a degree

(Section B continued)

of stability to allow the economy to run its course. A common theme throughout this whole time period, however, is the military industrial complex and the aim of increasing consumer goods.

Under Khrushchev, change was crucial. In 1957, he split the party into industrial and Agricultural sectors, regionalising agriculture into 105 regional economic councils (Sovnarkhozy). On one hand, this shows Khrushchev's commitment to improving agriculture, however it could also show his commitment to de-stalinisation — changing the Stalinist system as much as possible. However, Brezhnev's priority from the start of his regime (1963) was stability. Stability in politics, ~~was~~ but more importantly in the



(Section B continued) economy. Brezhnev went about reenergizing the party's agricultural + industrial wings, and placing economic control back into the hands of Glasnost. In many ways, this policy looked like a method of protection himself. Khrushchev and other members of the party had been the ones to remove Khrushchev from power following his radical changes. Therefore, Brezhnev knew that ~~he~~ to stay in power, he had to appease the stagnant party conservatives. This was his economic priority at this time, showing the shift from the change in 1953 to 63 to stagnation and stability in 1963 to 1985.

Furthermore, the urgency of the military-industrial complex changed in these years. AHH

(Section B continued) Furthermore, as technologies changed and developed throughout the 50's, 60's and 70's, so did the Russians priorities in the economy. Under Khrushchev, the evidence of backward heavy industries dominance was still evident. Khrushchev tried to increase innovation through introducing bonuses and allowing managers to keep 40% of the profits. However, he did not change or develop what the USSR was producing. However, under Brezhnev in 1963 to the 1970's, there was an attempt to combine science and technology with industry. This shows that Brezhnev's priorities, to some extent, were to modernise Russia economy as the most developed. This shows some change from the old fashioned, heavy industry orientated aims of the 1953-63 government under Khrushchev.

(Section B continued) Moreover, there is also evidence of continuity of economic priorities across this time period. Both Khrushchev and Brezhnev wanted to increase the amount of consumer goods produced by Russia. Khrushchev strove to promote light industry, and the continuation of this priority is shown by the fact that, in 1970, 85% of Soviet homes had television sets. Consumer goods were very important for this whole time period as both leaders had to make up for light industry's neglect under Stalin in his 5 yr plans.

Furthermore, the evidence of the military/industrial complex of the Soviet government across this whole time period is overwhelming. For example, between 1954 and 1985, Russia was involved in the arms

(Section B continued)

race of the cold war. There were millions of roubles and resources were poured into this effort. Under Brezhnev, the military budget grew to 13% of the GNP, as they began to fight the war in Afghanistan in the 70's. Showing Russia's status as a military and nuclear superpower was a clear priority for the whole of 1953 to 1985. Russia was always involved in some kind of conflict.

To conclude, I think that the priorities for Soviet industry + agriculture did change from 1954 to 1985. Khrushchev wanted reform and ~~re~~ change. Brezhnev wanted stability. Although there are continuities (military spending and emphasis on consumer goods), ultimately the different leaders wanted the economy to go in different directions.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

This response was placed at mid-Level 3 because it (1) offers some analysis of the priorities for Soviet industry and agriculture in the years 1953-85 and has a sound focus on change/continuity; (2) reasonable depth of knowledge is used to develop the argument (e.g. several of Khrushchev's and Brezhnev's priorities, and the role played by the Soviet military-industrial complex) and (3) an overall judgement is reached in the conclusion based on criteria (Khrushchev's reforming impulse and Brezhnev's commitment to stability) developed in the main analysis.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Tip

When planning your answer to a support / challenge question make sure you have a good balance of key points on either side of the argument, or be prepared to argue support and challenge within each key point.

## **Question 4**

On Question 4, stronger responses targeted how far the improved status of women was the most significant Soviet social development in the years 1917-85. These included an analysis of the links between key issues and a focus on the concept (significance) in the question. In addition, sufficient knowledge was used to assess the significance of the improved status of women (e.g. progressive nature of Soviet ideology/measures concerning divorce, equality and higher education, and better social provision for rural women from the 1950s) set against a range of other Soviet social developments (e.g. the general growth of the education and welfare sectors, (virtually) full employment since the 1930s). Judgements made about the relative significance of the improved status of women were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of how far the improved status of women was the most significant Soviet social development in the years 1917-85. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on significance or were essentially a description of social developments in the Soviet Union during these years. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it lacked range/depth (e.g. limited comments on Soviet women and job or educational opportunities). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

~~Overall, I do agree that the most significant social change was the improvement of ~~the~~ the status of women because~~

Overall, I do not agree that the most significant social development was the improvement in the status of women because the status of women, although it improved somewhat in the early years of the communist state, social issues such as education improved dramatically and improved the lives of many.

The status of women did not improve that much in many areas of life, one being in the political sector. For example, although the ~~status~~ Zhenotdel was created in 1917 to promote the role of women in politics, it was not used in 1930, Stalin removed ~~it~~ it as he claimed that its role had been achieved. This means an insignificant change in the status of women and ~~that~~ the news that it was not ~~of~~ one of the areas with the greatest social development because ~~it~~ ~~that~~ little had changed.

They considered the role of improving women in politics to be achieved and this emphasizes that

(Section B continued) their political status had not improved because ~~the fact~~ if they had improved their status then they would be permanent members and there would be a permanent branch to focus on women's rights and women in politics. Additionally, there were very few women that were in politics and it remained an area dominated by men. Alexandra Kollontai was one of the first women to be a member of the party and she was one of ~~the~~ only two that were ever part of the politburo. In a period of almost 70 years, this emphasizes that the status of women had not improved. They ~~remained~~ remained underrepresented ~~until~~ up until 1985. ~~The~~ politics were dominated by men who did not see the status of women as an important issue. This shows that the status of women was not the most significant social development that had taken place because, while under Lenin there had been some movement towards the development of their status, it had backtracked ~~by~~ ~~the~~ under Stalin.

Another factor that shows that the development of the status of women was not the most significant change ~~that~~ that socially took place is their role



(Section B continued) In so doing under Lenin, there had been improvement in terms of laws surrounding abortion (legalised in 1918) and equal rights to request a divorce. Crèches were supposed to be set up to ~~help women~~ remove women from the burdens of childcare however lack of resources meant that this was unable to take place. However, under Stalin and the system that remained afterwards, there was little improvement in their status in either the work place or at home. Despite dominating light industries such as textiles and being in key roles such as flying planes, ~~but~~ after WWII, ~~but~~ many women lost their jobs to men who were returning from war. They returned to either mundane, low skilled jobs or they went back to being housewives. Furthermore, although the equality payment law was passed under Lenin, women continued to be paid considerably less than their male counterparts, even if they were carrying out the same job.

The Great Retreat of 1936 is another piece of evidence that supports that ~~that~~ the ~~the~~ status of women ~~is~~ was not a significant social development. ~~that~~ The cost of divorce was increased from 4 roubles to 50

(Section B continued) troubles which meant, especially as never women were working or were in lower paid jobs, women were often tied to their husbands, unable to develop their own lives. Significant maternity grants were also given but, instead of emancipating women, it actually just reinforced their roles as mothers. While also being required on ~~excercises~~, women were ~~to~~ to struggle and expected to work, this developed significant ~~at~~ double burdens on women. This meant that, instead of their parts improving, they were actually put under twice as much pressure as they already had been. This highlights that the ~~Equality, the role of mothers & the importance~~ ~~is considered the~~ status of women was not the most significant ~~at~~ social change because their role remained many problems and expectations around women and they were unrepresented in politics until through early 1980s.

A social change that does however reflect a more significant amount of change is the development of education in ~~the~~ ~~the~~ the lifetimes of the USSR.

In the final years of the Tsar, ~~the~~ illiteracy was around 65%. This ~~the~~ gave ~~the~~ impetus ~~to~~

(Section B continued) The Soviet government to increase access and improve quality of the education, not just ideologically but also for industrial improvement.

By 1930, a traditional ~~GAH~~ comprehensive education system had been set up and by 1936, it was compulsory for children to attend primary school. This meant that everyone, despite their background, had access to education. This was a significant social improvement as, under the Tsarist system, education had ~~not~~ merely been reserved for the rich and privileged. Furthermore, it meant that children could access future job prospects and had better opportunities because they had access to widespread education.

There was also expansion into higher education, with ~~the~~ university being one of the key methods of gaining high status in the party. While this was ideologically driven, it did mean that higher education was open for many, whether they chose ~~the~~ a vocational or educational route.

Another factor that shows that education was a significant social development is the massive

(Section B continued) reduction in illiteracy. As previously stated, in 1917, illiteracy accounted to approximately 65% of the whole population. However, by the 1980's, 99% of the urban population were literate and 98% of the rural population were literate. This is strong evidence to support the idea that education underwent significant social development as there was a dramatic improvement in illiteracy. This also highlights that access to education was uniform across the majority of the country. Even in rural areas that had undergone significant hardship in the years of collectivisation, there was evident improvement. It also shows that focus on the education system and its improvement was common through all the leaders. The education system was a social <sup>change</sup> ~~development~~ that showed significant ~~development~~ ~~and~~ ~~development~~ development because of the equality of access and also the dramatic improvements in illiteracy rates, one of the fundamental aspects of education.

Overall, I disagree that the most significant social development that took place was the improvement in the status of women because there were other factors, such as education that showed a much more sustained

(Section B continued) *improvement. Also, there were still areas where the status of women remained insignificant.*



**ResultsPlus**  
**Examiner Comments**

This Level 4 response possesses several strengths, namely (1) it targets the improved status of Soviet women in the years 1917-85 and has a good focus on significance; (2) sufficient own knowledge is brought in to assess the significance of improved female status (e.g. by considering political involvement, social policies, employment and the Great Retreat of the 1930s) and other factors (the expansion of Soviet education) and (3) a reasoned judgement is reached in the conclusion based on the criteria of impact/lack of impact developed in the analysis.



**ResultsPlus**  
**Examiner Tip**

Higher level responses tend to offer clear reasoning and justification based on 'consideration of criteria'. This need not be laboriously laid out in generic terms. In this question, candidates justified 'most significant' in terms such as the lack of political advancement for women and the wider impact of increased educational provision.

## **Question 5**

On Question 5, stronger responses were clearly focused on the extracts, and possessed the confidence and understanding to develop an extract-based analysis of how far the Soviet Union collapsed because of Gorbachev's failure to deal with the challenge of nationalism. Higher scoring answers offered some comparative analysis of the two extracts, and used own knowledge effectively to examine the merits/validity of the views presented. Stronger responses were also focused on the precise question (the role played by Gorbachev's failure to deal with the challenge of nationalism), rather than the general issue of the fall of the Soviet Union, and put forward a reasoned judgement on the given issue, referencing the views in the extracts. Weaker answers tended to show some understanding of the extracts and attempted to focus on how far the Soviet Union collapsed because of Gorbachev's failure to deal with the challenge of nationalism. Such responses, however, demonstrated limited development by relying on a basic 'nationalism versus the economy' approach. At the lower levels, basic points were selected from the extracts for illustration and comparisons made between the two extracts were fairly rudimentary. Weaker candidates sometimes also relied almost exclusively on the extracts as sources of information about Gorbachev's failure to deal with the nationalist challenge and/or other factors. Others made limited use of the two extracts and attempted to answer the question relying largely on their own knowledge. Moreover, in lower scoring responses, the candidate's own knowledge tended to be illustrative (e.g. just tacked on to points from the extracts) or drifted from the main focus of the question. Furthermore, these answers were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

- 5 Historians have different views about the reasons for the fall of the Soviet Union. Analyse and evaluate the extracts and use your own knowledge of the issues to explain your answer to the following question.

How far do you agree with the view that the Soviet Union collapsed because of Gorbachev's failure to deal with the challenge of nationalism?

(20)

Westwood

Failure to deal with nationalism

Reservations about free-end of Brezhnev doctrine  
Glasnost released nationalist feelings

There is much debate between historians as to whether the Soviet Union collapsed because of Gorbachev's failure to deal with the challenge of nationalism? There is no doubt that nationalism must have played a significant role in the collapse of the USSR as the republics would not have declared their independence without good reason but the extent to which this caused the collapse is arguable. In extract 1, Westwood focuses on the role of Gorbachev in exacerbating the feeling of nationalist sentiments by introducing glasnost which allowed such movements to thrive and by his reluctance to impose the will of the USSR on its republics. In contrast to this,

(Section C continued) McLarley in extract 2 focuses on the effect that Gorbachev's excessive desire for economic reform had and how it contributed to the collapse of the Soviet Union.

In Extract 1, Westwood talks of Gorbachev's 'insistence on glasnost' and the how this reduced the government's ability to 'keep nationalist feelings under tight control'. Gorbachev had introduced glasnost to make the party more transparent to the people so that they were not kept in the dark about the realities of the Soviet Union ~~and its problems~~. Although this was achieved, it opened up the party to a wave of criticisms and enabled people to openly talk about the issues of the Soviet government without the fear of being attacked as a dissident. Within a few months, 60,000 informal groups had formed organising demonstrations and holding meetings as they complained about issues such as housing and environmental issues. An example of how glasnost contributed to the rise of nationalist sentiments is that it allowed Popular fronts to emerge in the Baltic republics. These republics had been annexed by the USSR as part of the Nazi-Soviet pact and felt the USSR were an invading force. The general population were also worried about the environmental impact of the USSR's industry. Therefore, as Westwood puts it, gave put-up



(Section C continued) national feeling an opportunity of expression. Westwood argues that the Bolsheviks and so the government of the USSR could only maintain their control over the republics as long as such nationalist feelings were kept under 'tight control'.

~~to extract 2~~, McCauley looks at the collapse of the USSR in terms of the effect of Gorbachev's economic reform on the Soviet economy. He states outright that 'Gorbachev's reform attempts at economic reform provoked a collapse' due largely to Gorbachev's impatience and desire to introduce more and more radical reform. This can be seen in the way that Gorbachev quickly moved from his policy of acceleration under the Twelfth Five Year Plan to economic perestroika in 1987. Gorbachev initially aimed at essentially tinkering with the system by improving the efficiency of the extremely inflexible command economy. However, he quickly moved to introduce market mechanisms through the ~~the~~ encouragement of joint ventures <sup>in many</sup> in 1987 and the legalisation of cooperatives in 1988. McCauley explains that 'none of these economists had ever worked in a market economy' which goes some way to suggest why economic perestroika failed, however it was also largely down to the system inherited by Gorbachev. Local state bureaucrats were reluctant

(Section C continued) to implement Gorbachev's policies because it threatened to weaken their position. However an argument which backs up Melanuk's point is that by 1990 there were only 3,000 joint foreign ventures which contributed little to the Soviet economy.

There is much evidence to suggest that it was nationalist sentiments which led to the collapse of the USSR. Due to Gorbachev's reluctance to use force, he ~~did~~ ended the Brezhnev doctrine, thus allowing countries of the Eastern Bloc to declare independence one by one in 1989 and give hope to other nationalist groups within the USSR. However, there was a limit to this nationalism, as despite nationalist feelings, many republics benefited from the Soviet Union's economy and in a referendum in 1991, 11 out of 15 of the Republics declared they wished to remain within the USSR. Rather it was the role that Glasnost ~~and~~ played in Russia itself that allowed reformers such as Yeltsin to lead undermine the Soviet Government so that it was left without any real power. In terms of the economy and the point that Melanuk makes about the 'living standards of the people' dropping, this was not a major contributor to the collapse of the USSR. As historian Orlando Figes argues, many nations had suffered much worse economic circumstances and ~~still~~ their government's survived. There are further limits

(Section C continued) to McLanley's interpretation as he claims Gorbachev listened to more and 'more radical economists' as they promised him success. However, to counter this argument, in 1989 one of Gorbachev's economic advisors Shatalin proposed the 500 days programme which would launch a market-based economy, however the Soviet Government and Gorbachev dismissed it.

In conclusion, Gorbachev's failure to deal with nationalism resulted in the Soviet government being undermined by the Democratic movement in Russia which rather than the economy led to the collapse of the USSR.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 4 response possesses several obvious strengths, namely (1) it offers a clear understanding of the extracts and uses this to develop an analysis of the competing views provided by Westwood and McCauley; (2) it uses own knowledge effectively to examine the strengths and weaknesses of these views; (3) it is focused on the precise issue (Gorbachev's failure to deal with the challenge of nationalism) rather than the general controversy concerning the collapse of the Soviet Union and (4) it offers a reasoned judgement on the given issue, which references the views discussed in the extracts.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Good responses often use the introduction to set up the debate, by identifying the main arguments offered by the two interpretations. This is then followed by an exploration of these arguments in the main analysis.

## ***Paper Summary***

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

### **Section A/B responses**

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Candidates paying close attention to the date ranges in the question
- Sufficient consideration given to the issue in the question (e.g. main factor), as well as some other factors
- Explain their judgement fully – this need not be in an artificial or abstract way, but demonstrate their thinking in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about
- Focus carefully on the second-order concept targeted in the question
- Give consideration to timing, to enable themselves to complete all three questions with approximately the same time given over to each one
- An appropriate level, in terms of depth of detail and analysis, as required by the question – e.g. a realistic amount to enable a balanced and rounded answer on breadth questions

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Pay little heed to the precise demands of the question, e.g. write about the topic without focusing on the question, or attempt to give an answer to a question that hasn't been asked – most frequently, this meant treating questions which targeted other second-order concepts as causation questions
- Answer a question without giving sufficient consideration to the given issue in the question (e.g. looking at other causes, consequences, etc, with only limited reference to that given in the question)
- Answers which only gave a partial response, e.g. a very limited span of the date range, or covered the stated cause/consequence, with no real consideration of other issues
- Assertion of change, causation, sometimes with formulaic repetition of the words of the question, with limited explanation or analysis of how exactly this was a change, cause, of the issue within the question.
- Judgement is not reached, or not explained
- A lack of detail

## Section C responses

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Candidates paying close attention to the precise demands of the question, as opposed to seemingly pre-prepared material covering the more general controversy as outlined in the specification
- Thorough use of the extracts; this need not mean using every point they raise, but a strong focus on these as views on the question
- A confident attempt to use the two extracts together, e.g. consideration of their differences, attempts to compare their arguments, or evaluate their relative merits
- Careful use of own knowledge, e.g. clearly selected to relate to the issues raised within the extracts, confidently using this to examine the arguments made, and reason through these in relation to the given question; at times, this meant selection over sheer amount of knowledge
- Careful reading of the extracts, to ensure the meaning of individual statements and evidence within these were used in the context of the broader arguments made by the authors
- Attempts to see beyond the stark differences between extracts, e.g. consideration of the extent to which they disagreed, or attempts to reconcile their arguments

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Limited use of the extracts, or an imbalance in this, e.g. extensive use of one, with limited consideration of the other
- Limited comparison or consideration of the differences between the given interpretations
- Using the extracts merely as sources of support
- Heavy use of own knowledge, or even seemingly pre-prepared arguments, without real consideration of the arguments in the extracts
- Statements or evidence from the source being used in a manner contrary to that given in the extracts
- e.g. through misinterpretation of the meaning of the arguments, or lifting of detail without thought to the context of how it was applied within the extract
- A tendency to see the extracts as being polar opposites, again seemingly through expectation of this, without thought to where there may be degrees of difference, or even common ground

## **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>



Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.