

Examiners' Report

June 2025

GCE History 9HI0 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 <https://www.edexcel.com> or <https://www.btec.co.uk>.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our [contact us page](#).



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 <https://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: <https://www.pearson.com/uk>.

June 2025

Publications Code 9HI0_1E_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Introduction

It was once again pleasing to see candidates of all abilities engage effectively with this year's A Level paper 1E, which deals with Russia, 1917-91: from Lenin to Yelstin.

The time frames, topics and conceptual focuses of this year's paper were dealt with well by candidates. Candidates were well prepared for the examined areas. Most answers were broadly in line with the indicative content in the mark scheme, but some candidates offered information and analysis beyond that which we anticipated. In section C the extracts offered no apparent difficulties for the majority of candidates and provided an accessible interpretative framework.

The advice offered to centres and candidates remains similar to last year.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A is comprised of a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting any of the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity/difference and significance with a time frame of not less than ten years. Section B offers a further choice of essays using an extended time frame of not less than one third of that offered by the specification as a whole. Section C contains a compulsory question which is based on two given extracts. It assesses analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations in context (AO3). Candidates in the main appeared to organise their time effectively, although there were some cases of candidates not completing one of the three responses within the time allocated. Examiners did note a number of scripts that posed some problems with the legibility of handwriting. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

Of the three sections of Paper 1, candidates are generally more familiar with the essay sections, and in sections A and B most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. Candidates in the main were able to apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner suited to the different demands of the questions in section A and B. Thus, where section A questions targeted a shorter time period candidates deployed a greater depth of knowledge in comparison to the more careful selection generally required for section B questions which cover a broader time frame.

Candidates do need to formulate their planning so that there is an argument and a counter argument within their answer; some candidates lacked sufficient treatment of these. The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks, and centres should note how these strands progress through the levels. Candidates do need to be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that they draw their evidence in responses from the appropriate time period.

In section C, the stronger answers were able to demonstrate a clear focus on the need to discuss different arguments given within the two extracts, clearly recognising these as historical interpretations. These responses tended to offer comparative analysis of the merits of the different views, exploring the credibility of the arguments offered by the two historians in the light of the evidence offered by both the extracts, and candidates' own contextual knowledge. Such responses tended to avoid attempts to examine the extracts in a manner more suited to AO2, assertions of the inferiority of an extract on the basis of it offering less factual evidence, or a

drift away from the specific demands of the question to the wider taught topic.

Question 1

Question 1 asked candidates to consider whether the purges of the 1930s in the Soviet Union were primarily due to Stalin's personality. This was the more popular question in Section A and it elicited some of the best answers with candidates expressing robust opinions and applying their knowledge thoughtfully.

Successful candidates maintained a focus on causation. At the top end causation was exemplified as in the indicative content of the mark scheme. Reasons addressing why the purges of the 1930s occurred were exemplified well through aspects surrounding paranoia and Stalin's suspicious nature as well as Stalin's vindictive use of the purges to remove old rivals. These were often analysed against other causal reasons such as genuine political threats in the form of Kirov, the role of the NKVD and economic needs to provide scapegoats. The best answers recognised that multiple causal factors were at play, but that Stalin's personality exacerbated the scale or the intensity of the purges. This approach created sustained and thorough arguments.

At level 3 there was often plenty of rewardable, relevant material offered, but the criteria by which to make a judgement was less secure. In many cases candidates provided a range of reasons but did not develop their chosen reasons into an analysis centred on causation.

Less successful candidates misinterpreted the concept of 'personality' and offered information surrounding Stalin's Cult of Personality. Whilst this could be made relevant it limited a full discussion focused on the demands of the question and its second order concept.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☐

The purges of the 1930s were primarily due to Stalin's personality. In the years 1935-38 10% of the population was purged - about 10 million people. Whilst some were shot, others faced gruelling imprisonment in the Gulags. The factor that affected all these the most was Stalin's personality. However, there were other factors such as Krim's murder and the role of the secret police. The criteria that can be used to judge the extent of past factors include short versus long term and the affect on factor has on another. Therefore, the purges of the 1930s were mainly due to Stalin's personality.

Stalin's rule can be categorised by ^{his} ~~totalitarian~~ authoritarian, totalitarian control. Despite Lenin's explicit desire for Stalin not to become leader of the USSR (from his testament written before he died) Stalin was still able to outmanoeuvre his opponents and ^{eventually} become the only member of the Politburo that met daily during the civil war under Lenin's left. Through violence and political manipulation opponents such as Bukharin, Kamenov and Zinoviev fell victim to the Show trials and purging. The common denominator in these ~~factor's~~ deaths was Stalin's personality, which was fuelled by paranoia (perhaps

(Section A continued) linking to Khrushchev's murder). Moreover, once Stalin had created his cult there was no stopping it until he reached its fever pitch in the Post War years - the Generalissimo was no longer recognizable alongside the posters and statues that depicted him. Stalin's ego would stand or fall. Hence, Stalin's personality was a long-term reason for the purges. Moreover, his role was integrally linked to the other factors. Therefore, Stalin's personality was the primary reason for the purges in the 1930s.

Khrushchev's murder was the catalyst of the purges, but this doesn't mean he was the prime reason. Murdered on 1st December 1934, Khrushchev's murder sparked the violent purging that followed the next 4 years. The suspicious context surrounding the murder has left historians questioning about Khrushchev's role in the purges. Nikhruyev had been taught how to use a gun by the NKVD and Khrushchev was missing his ~~bodyguard~~ bodyguard but that doesn't mean it wasn't all orchestrated by Stalin. At the Congress of Victors Khrushchev received a standing ovation and 1200 votes whilst Stalin only received 900. The dictatorship Stalin ruled meant no one could be as popular as him. Hence Stalin's desire for personal power meant he may well have been involved in Khrushchev's murder. Thus, despite being a short-term factor it was more of a catalyst that jumpstarted the purges rather than what lit the fuse initially. Therefore, Stalin's personality played a greater role in the causes of the purges.

(Section A continued) than Kirov's.

Another factor that could have caused the purges may have been the secret Police or NKVD (renamed in 1934). All three leaders under Stalin had been highly influential: Yezhov, Yagoda and Beria. During the purges Yagoda nicknamed the 'bloody dwarf' had relished in the pain he could cause his victims - he once arrived at a meeting with bloodstained gloves - this means he may well have carried out or even created the purges to exercise his own authority. The fact that he was purged himself in 1938 may imply the significance of his role.

Alternatively, he may have just been scapegoated as Stalin chose to end the Purges. Since the NKVD followed too well, does this mean their desire came from a sadistic longing for Purges. However, since the quotas were signed off daily by Stalin this suggests Stalin's personality still played a heavy role. Therefore, Stalin's personality can be considered the main reason for the purges of the 1930s.

Overall, ~~there are many reasons~~ Stalin's personality was the main reason for the purges in the 1930s. His cult and paranoia highlight his tendency to purge to an increasing extent, this is developed by Lenin's desire for him to not have personal power. Moreover, the nature of Kirov's murder (since he was more popular than Stalin at the Congress of Victims) could suggest that Stalin was involved in the catalyst for the

(Section A continued) purges. Finally the NKVD's headed by Yezhov's desire to successful quotas could be due to his sadistic tendencies or, more likely, were simply following command from Stalin. Hence, Stalin affected both other factors as well as being a long term factor in himself. Therefore, Stalin's personality was the ~~main~~ ^{primary} reason for the purges in the USSR in the 1930s.



This is an example of a response operating in level 5. The candidate has offered a considered and confident response that connects its range back to Stalin's personality throughout. They have explored key issues ranging from paranoia to Kirov's murder and the utilisation of the secret police. The range of reasons shows sufficient knowledge is deployed and the second order concept of causation is understood. Criteria and connections are established by the candidate in the introduction and whilst sometimes these are more loosely applied, the relative significance of reasons is evaluated throughout. This answer was awarded level 5, 18 marks.



Candidates are encouraged to spend a few minutes planning the direction of their answer and thinking about how their chosen factors have relative significance against the stated factor and other factors employed in their response. This will help to maintain a focus on the conceptual focus.

Question 2

Question 2 asked candidates to consider whether Brezhnev's leadership was the main reason for political stagnation in the USSR in the years 1964-82. This question was not as popular as question 1 and responses were mixed.

Successful candidates maintained a focus on causation. At the top end causation was exemplified as in the indicative content of the mark scheme. Reasons addressing why Brezhnev's leadership led to political stagnation were exemplified well through main policies such as 'trust in cadres' and its resultant gerontocracy as well as Brezhnev's decisions to reverse Khrushchev's reforms. These were often analysed against other causal reasons such as the roles of other politburo members and legacies from the past. The best answers recognised the links between economic and political stagnation and engaged with causation thoughtfully. A few saw some merit in stagnation and a more stable political system.

At level 3 there was often plenty of rewardable, relevant material offered, but the criteria by which to make a judgement was less secure. In many cases candidates sought to blame Brezhnev with a limited counter argument or digressed into a discussion on economic stagnation that did not link back to the demands of the question posed.

Less successful candidates offered descriptions of Brezhnev's tenure without much focus on the second order concept of causation.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒ Question 2 ☒

It is largely accurate to suggest that Brezhnev's leadership was the main reason for political stagnation in the USSR between 1964 and 1982; Brezhnev's policies aimed to reverse the radical & unpopular reforms made by Khrushchev, but in doing so led to a growing generational gap between the government and society. Examples of these policies include the reverse of the split between industry and Agriculture, the abolishment + recentralisation of economic councils, and, most importantly, the 'Stability / Trust in cadres'. While these were integral components of Brezhnev's leadership, it must also be acknowledged that stagnation after him was furthered under the practice of 'gerontocracy'. Therefore while it is largely accurate to say Brezhnev's leadership resulted in political stagnation, it is imperative to simultaneously recognise stagnation after his lead (the product of a multitude of other factors).

The most profound factor of Brezhnev's leadership that contributed to stagnation is the 'Trust / Stability in cadres'; promotions and demotions were discouraged within the government, and while this led to increased job security for officials, it also meant that the government

(Section A continued)

was aging. This policy was a direct juxtaposition of Khrushchev's 'rotation of cadres' reform, which introduced 16 year fixed terms for all senior positions in government. Under Khrushchev, nearly 50% of the Central Committee was replaced. Brezhnev implemented these reforms as his leadership style was one of stability over reform, and therefore explains how the 'stability of cadres' policy led to only two promotions into the Politburo under his rule, and subsequently how Brezhnev's leadership led to political stagnation in the USSR between 1962-85, 1964-82.

Furthermore, when Brezhnev established his position in government, he needed to do it by gaining support from the population and government after significant discontent with Khrushchev's leadership (especially his later reforms). He ~~the~~ therefore took a centralised approach and de-established the ¹⁰⁵ 'Sovnarkhozy' (created (new economic councils)) by recentralising them in Moscow. While this is a significant aspect of Brezhnev's leadership as a non-reformist, it goes hand-in-hand with an unproductive economy due to a lack of incentive. The reverse of the split between agriculture and industry, though popular among society + the government, ~~the~~ exacerbated a lack of focus on either due to Brezhnev's unwillingness to make any significant reforms. These factors, coupled with an aging government due to 'stability of cadres' that were increasingly ineffective in their positions and 'out of touch',

(Section A continued)

convincingly explain how political stagnation was largely a product of Brezhnev's leadership.

Political stagnation in the USSR was also largely contributed to by corruption. Brezhnev was actually implicated in corruption himself as due to his feigned ignorance of the existence of a Black market (due to his failing economy), his daughter's lover 'Boris the Gypsy' had been able to smuggle diamonds from the market. The existence of a black market was also contributed heavily too by corrupt senior officials that partook in illegal activities; they rarely feared any consequences as 'stability in cadres' made it look hugely unlikely that they would face any consequences for their actions, be in their career or personal lives. Therefore Brezhnev's unwillingness to be a reformist leader did lead to corruption and political stagnation in the USSR from 1964-82.

However, it is arguably the furthered practice of 'gerontocracy' that led to political stagnation; Both Andropov & Chernenko were increasingly old when they took on the role as head of the Communist Party (Chernenko so much so it was mostly Gorbachev that did everything on his behalf), and this

(Section A continued)

led to a generational gap between the government and society. However, Andropov in power did advocate and allow for a rise of the younger generation in government. Also, this generational gap was indirectly caused by 'stability of cadres', discrediting another factor, other than Brezhnev's leadership,² making the blame for political stagnation.

Furthermore, Andropov did aim to tackle corruption with his 'Anti-corruption' campaign, whereby he prosecuted corrupt soviet senior officials that were using the regime to make themselves rich. As he also prosecuted Boris the Gypsy after Brezhnev's death. The black market did exist as a product of an inefficient economy, and thus takes responsibility off of Brezhnev partially for stagnation. However, should his leadership style been more open to political reform (to prevent corruption) political stagnation may not have intensified to the point of stagnation.

In conclusion, it is largely convincing to acknowledge that Brezhnev's leadership was instrumental, in, and the main reason for, political stagnation in the USSR between 196⁴ and 8³. This was exemplified in the reverse of all of Khrushchev's progressive reforms, corruption etc. While Andropov did make efforts to reduce

(Section A continued)

stagnation and corruption. 'stability of cadres' was still the main reason for political stagnation in the USSR between 1964-82.



This is an example of a level 4 response. The candidate offers a line of argument in the introduction that agrees with the question's causal focus and is suggestive of a counter argument. However, the direction of the counter argument is not specified. Sufficient knowledge is given on Brezhnev's leadership with a range of aspects being explored and the focus is maintained on political stagnation. The candidate chooses to digress from the time frame posed in the question, incorporating Andropov and Chernenko's tenures from 1982-85. Whilst this is not inaccurate it is not relevant to the demands of the question. The response was awarded level 4, 15 marks.



It is good practice to explore a range of aspects on the causal reason given in the question; however, to excel at causation questions candidates need to discuss alternatives and weigh up their relative significance.

Question 3

Question 3 asked candidates how accurate it is to say that, in the years 1917-85, Soviet government policy on the arts and culture changed. This question was the most popular in Section B and candidates seemed well prepared to answer it, particularly on the arts.

Successful candidates maintained a focus on the second order concepts of change and continuity, but with more of an emphasis on change. At the top end change was exemplified as in the indicative content of the mark scheme. Changes in Soviet government policy on the arts and culture were exemplified well through main policies such as Lenin's avant-garde and Proletkult, Stalin's Socialist Realism and Khrushchev's de-Stalinisation as well as more popular music under Brezhnev. For the counter argument continuities surrounding the arts' involvement in propaganda and the continuation of persecution and challenging of non-conformists were applied successfully by candidates. More often than not, the best answers opted for a thematic route rather than a chronological approach. This meant responses offered direct comparisons of levels of control, aims, and opposition within fields such as music, film, art and literature which enabled candidates to better gauge the extent of change in different aspects. At the top end there was secure use of the language of change with lines of argument noting where transformations, shifts and indeed continuities were evident.

At level 3 there was often plenty of rewardable, relevant material offered, but the criteria by which to make a judgement was less secure. In many cases candidates focused more on the arts rather than on both the arts and culture. It was common to see descriptive approaches with each leader being addressed sequentially – in these cases the conceptual focus was added on rather than fully assessed.

Less successful candidates interpreted culture as social attitudes, or focused excessively on cults of personality, detracting from broader cultural developments without much focus on the second order concepts of change and continuity.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒ Question 4 ☒

Control of arts and culture was an essential method for successive leaders of the USSR to increase their power over the people, both directly and indirectly. The idea that policies towards the arts and culture changed between 1917-85 will be assessed based on how consistent policies were in their aims, as well as their severity and frequency on artists. Overall, while ~~the arts~~ policies on the arts and culture continued throughout the time period, the scope and severity of these fluctuated greatly, proving to be incredibly inconsistent and making it difficult for artists to understand the ever-changing parameters of what was permitted.

Under Lenin, Proletkult (People's culture) was encouraged by leaders, particularly the strand of the Constructivists. These people set out to produce their own culture, as seen through the re-enactment of the storming of the Winter Palace in 1921 involving over 8,000 people. This individualism,

(Section B continued)

where people were encouraged to develop their own viewpoints and interpretations shows a level of leniency that successive leaders did not possess. While restrictions were later imposed on prolekt in the early 1920s, the sheer fact that Lenin was willing to allow free thought and the production of liberal, contemporary work was drastically different from other leaders; the severity of Lenin's policies towards arts and culture were minimal on the whole. Stalin, however, imposed hefty restrictions. This included a removal of ~~prolet~~ prolekt, to be replaced by the Union of Soviet Writers, who were set up to monitor any anti-Soviet dissidence. This led to the 'Genre of Silence' in the 1930s, where particularly writers (like Boris Pasternak) stopped writing, with many being sent to gulags or committing suicide. This shows a large inconsistency, as artists under Lenin were able to flourish but under Stalin they became repressed. Policies were much more severe and frequent under Stalin, ~~alongside the aims of art and culture policies being not largely different. Lenin aimed to gain mass support by imposing certain~~ Therefore, government policies towards arts and culture in the early time period fluctuated

(Section B continued)

drastically because Lenin's policies allowed for free expression so long as there were communist principles within, however Stalin set up a new branch in order to heavily monitor dissidence.

Thus Stalin's art and cultural policies were equally as inconsistent with Khrushchev. In his 1956 Secret Speech, he declared his policy of de-Stalinisation, which encompassed arts and culture. As an example, novels by Solzhenitsyn (previously banned and censored under Stalin) were allowed to be published. These novels were highly critical of Stalin and his purges. This shows that policies mildly changed ~~to~~, allowing a heightened sense of leniency almost comparative to Lenin. Novels critical of the USSR were able to be read by the public, a groundbreaking achievement when previously any critique of the USSR would have been sent to the gulag under Stalin. By 1964, Brezhnev reintroduced some conservative policies. For example, Solzhenitsyn was expelled from the USSR in 1974 due to his earlier writings that had been allowed under Khrushchev. This later period between 1953-85 was particularly inconsistent. Many had

(Section B continued)

criticised Khrushchev for his erratic and unpredictable nature - novels critical of the USSR were allowed, yet Komsomol leaders were deployed throughout the streets to monitor illegal dance moves in 1961. Brezhnev arguably narrowed the boundaries for artists (no 'anti-Soviet propaganda under article 70'), yet this made it easier for artists to know what was permissible. Therefore, while the period after Stalin's death was largely inconsistent due to the fluctuating severity and frequency of policies, Brezhnev's more conservative approach brought a sense of continuity for the 1970s- and 1980s that had not been experienced since Stalin's regime.

Artistically, Lenin encouraged art as part of avant-garde, a mixture of modernism and futurism - as seen by the propaganda poster 'Beat the whites with the Red wedge'. This style may have conveyed messages visually to the population, which was important given 65% were illiterate. This idea of using visual posters as a governmental policy to control the people was incredibly consistent under all leaders. This is seen with the 'Morning of Our Motherland'

(Section B continued)

poster under Stalin and the popular oversight ('The Lazy Bureaucrat' and 'The Alcoholic') under Khrushchev. This shows that, while the serenity of policies was mildly different, alongside the style of art, the aims of these leaders' policies remained remarkably consistent. They all utilised cinema, radio, literature and art to sustain their regime, despite the fact that their other policies varied drastically. Therefore, while it is clear that the frequency and serenity of policies was inconsistent, the purpose and aims of each leader's cultural policy remained consistent and predominantly successful.

A final clear difference is the use of ^{and terror} violence in their cultural policies. Under Lenin, those who were not communists but were simply sympathetic to the regime were still allowed to create art, dubbed 'Fellow Travellers' by Trotsky. Whereas, by the end of the time period, Brezhnev brought back show-trial-esque trials, with the 1966 Daniel-Sinyavsky trial, where they were sentenced to 5 and 7 years in prison. This is an incredibly clear inconsistency once again. ~~Lenin allowed for the~~ Lenin encouraged less harsh

(Section B continued)

measures, whereas terror and prison sentences remained used in the 1960s. Therefore, it is ~~addi~~ further clear how policies fluctuated in their severity, particularly regarding consequences for non-conformity

The evidence presented clearly suggests that government policies on the arts and culture changed wildly. While the aims and purpose of policies certainly remained consistent, the severity, leniency and scope adapted accordingly with each leader, leading to high levels of fluctuation and uncertainty



This is an example of an answer operating at the top of level 4. This answer addresses most of the chronological range of the question set. It judges changes/continuities clearly throughout. Culture and arts are both addressed although this is uneven. Arts and culture are both deployed, though arts are addressed less, thus meaning the response meets 'most demands' rather than 'responding fully'. The focus is on change and consistency and the language of change is utilised well. This can be seen with the idea of 'drastic' change and 'wild change' showing the demands of the question are mostly being met. This was awarded level 4, 16 marks.



This chronological approach is successful as it embeds analysis throughout.

Question 4

Question 4 asked candidates how accurate it is to say that the most significant Soviet social development in the years 1924-85 was the provision of social security. This question drew a wide range of responses with many being able to effectively identify areas of social security and other social developments to discuss.

Successful candidates maintained a focus on the second order concept of significance. At the top end significance was exemplified as in the indicative content of the mark scheme. Social security was exemplified through housing, healthcare, benefits and employment. For the counter argument other Soviet social developments were centred on the provision of education and the status of women. Candidates gave particularly good commentaries on health, housing and education. The best answers set out criteria that assessed the impact and longevity of policies and prioritised factors weighing up their relative significance.

In the middle of the mark scheme there was often plenty of rewardable, relevant material offered, but many candidates discussed some of the content classed as 'social security' as alternative factors. Whilst this worked for most, it led to some candidates producing an unbalanced response with no real alternatives being explored.

Less successful candidates did not understand the meaning of social security and interpreted the focus of the question as the general security of the USSR. This led to misfocused responses.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

plan:

new family code
abortion divorce
maternity
tax on single

skyrocket
double shift
wages
wile early

family

social
development

employment

full
hidden unemployment
job satisfaction
turnout rate

pension, health care spending
vaccine

provision
social
security

long-lasting
signif

housing

Namkornin

kommunalka
khmarchyorka

~~The~~ Soviet social development has been seen as advanced and pioneer in the modern world since Lenin established the social welfare system that was still rare among the world in that period. It is ~~more~~ ^{fairly} accurate to say that the most significant Soviet social development in the years 1924-85 was the provision of social security, as housing, employment, ^{and} family ^{and} ~~was~~ also vital factors.

~~The provision of social security was significant~~
~~It is fairly accurate~~ In Soviet social development, as it can be measured by the spending on social welfare budget and the groups of people it covered.

(Section B continued) Stalin ^{enhanced} ~~made~~ the social benefits by introducing free lunch in factories and schools, with developed and improved urban infrastructure such as Moscow Metro, and provided vaccines for common diseases, which was significant especially in urban areas for social development as ^{urban} ~~people~~ workers had better infrastructure ^{to use} ~~and~~. It is further developed by Khrushchev and Brezhnev, as health care spending doubled ^{and pensions quadrupled} in the years of 1953 to 1960. Brezhnev expanded the healthcare and pension spendings every year with making most of the utilising bills free of charge and ^{keeping} low price of consumer goods, showing a widespread extent of significance in ~~developing~~ social development. However, ^{although} the pensions were extended to peasants under Khrushchev, it was inconsistent as Brezhnev excluded peasants again under his expanding pension budget. Moreover, there was significant inequalities between the equipment and ^{quality} ~~the~~ of healthcare in rural and urban places, as some ^{hospitals} ~~hospitals~~ had no running water in Ukraine until 1988. Thus, the provision of social security was ^{fairly} ~~moderately~~ significant in Soviet social development as it is only limited to urban workers.

(Section B continued) Housing is another significant part that has contributed to the social development in Soviet society. ^{as it can be measured by the condition of housing and its availability} Khrushchev was ^{stressed} largely built under Stalin to solve the strain of urban housing with the rapid urbanisation. This was evolved under Khrushchev, who established Khrushchyorka that provided a bigger space for family to stay with running water and expanded quickly as it ^{could be} easily constructed, showing a widespread significance in improving the life of Soviets. However, the housing provided under Stalin were extremely small with 4 to 5 square metres shared by one family with no running water, and in factory, such as Moscow Coal Field, ^{150,000} ~~100,000~~ beds ^{were} shared by 200,000 workers, showing an extreme harsh living conditions. Although the rebuild of factories after the Great Patriotic war was quick, it did not ~~factor~~ ^{prioritize} living houses for people. But under Khrushchev and Brezhnev although housing were ^{made} ~~been~~ available to people, there was still large amount of citizens waiting for allocation of housing, showing a failure to solve the ^{stress} housing issue and progress on social development. Thus, although housing

(Section B continued) has achieved superficial significance in promoting social development, it was not as significant as social security as it only covered a limited amount of urban workers while social provision covered all urban workers.

Employment is fairly significant in Soviet social development, as it can be measured by employment rate, turnout rate and job satisfaction. Full employment is guaranteed under Stalin, Khrushchev and Brezhnev as everyone involved in the building of socialism is the principle of communist ideology. Especially for female, ~~the~~ ^{the} employment of women workers expanded 300 per cent under Five-Year Plans of Stalin, showing a great progress of social development. However, there was an unequal pay between women and men workers as they only received 60 - 65 per cent of pay as men, moreover, the social contract principle under Brezhnev that exchange political loyalty ^{by providing} social benefits had ~~covered~~ ^{emerged} the fake full employment, as 20 per cent of works in 1980s was unuseful, with hidden unemployment rate of up to 10

(Section B continued) per cent for female. Thus, employment is a long-lasting but superficial significance for the social development in Soviet society, as hidden unemployment existed, and it did not directly benefit workers and peasants as the social provision.

Family policies is another factor that is significant in social development in Soviet society, ~~The~~ ^{this can} ~~Now~~ be measured by the divorce rate and abortion rate that revealed the stability of the society. The new Family Code established in 1936 outlawed abortion and increase the barriers to divorce by increasing the fees and ~~the~~ ^{require} both to attend meetings, for encouraging the reservation of families. ~~Stalin~~ ^{Stalin} encouraged the birth rate by giving extra income as 25 per cent of extra income can be received by mother who had two children, a payment of 2000 roubles was given to mother with over 6 kids, strongly develop the social stability by strengthen the family link. This is somehow continued as ^{access to} contraception was kept low under Khrushchev and Brezhnev. However, the abortion was legalised again under Khrushchev.

(Section B continued) which largely increase the instability of family, as a woman will have 8 abortions in average in her life in 1980s. Same as the divorce rate, though Brezhnev tried to preserve the family, almost one thirds of marriage in Moscow ended up with divorce, showing a widespread failure of the aim to promote social development. Thus, family politics ~~are~~ ^{are} superficially significant to the social development as it failed to preserve the family link and it is not as ~~deep~~ ^{deep} as social provision that had actually and directly benefit the people.

In conclusion, it is fairly accurate to say that the most significant Soviet social development in the years 1924-80 was the provision of social security, although it is limited to the extent as it did not particularly benefit peasants, and housing, family politics and employment played an important role at the same time.



This is an example of a level 5 response for question 4. The candidate offers a range of aspects including social security and alternatives in their response. They address the whole of the time frame successfully. Criteria are established and applied throughout the response. Whilst relative significance is not fully secure, it is discussed and therefore meets the level 5 mark scheme. A considered response is therefore given that meets the full demands of the question posed. This answer was awarded level 5, 20 marks.



A brief plan is always a good idea. It helps to formulate the direction of your response enabling you to write efficiently.

Question 5

Question 5 asked candidates to consider whether the USSR collapsed in 1991 because of the impact of the nationalist resurgence in the communist states of Eastern Europe. The majority of candidates were able to demonstrate understanding of the extracts in terms of the growth and impact of nationalism (extract 1) versus the role of both Gorbachev and his policies (extract 2).

Candidates at the top end could develop the interpretations in both extracts through the addition of their own evidence and argument. The majority of successful candidates knew about Eastern European revolts as well as the 'Sinatra Doctrine'. The resurgence of nationalists appears to have been well understood. The counter argument concerning Gorbachev and the failure of reforms was exemplified well with *perestroika* and *glasnost* featuring heavily. Many successfully brought in knowledge and most recognised nationalism's interplay with increased openness and criticism in the USSR. The strongest responses identified themes across both extracts and were able to employ these to analyse the contrasting interpretations and evaluate their convincingness.

Candidates at level 3 tended to spend too long explaining the content of the extracts rather than engaging with the interpretations that they offered. This meant they were judging the quality of the extract rather than the interpretations in them.

Less successful candidates tended to select points in isolation and judge whether this was accurate by applying own knowledge. There were some examples of heavy description that veered away from the extracts and the debate under discussion. Candidates are reminded to keep the interpretations at the core of their responses for AO3 answers.

SECTION C

Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.

- 5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the USSR collapsed in 1991 because of the impact of the nationalist resurgence in the communist states of Eastern Europe?

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

(20)

Over the years, historians have debated the reason as to why the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991. On one hand Dornin argues it was because of nationalism in the Eastern Bloc as he states 'the revolt spread quickly across the 'inner ~~or~~ empire' of the Soviet Union' which suggests that a domino effect occurred as a result of the fall in the Eastern Bloc. On the other hand, Alan Aslund argues that it was because 'economic growth did not improve' thereby suggesting that it was due to a ~~lack of~~ ^{weak} economy that it collapsed.

One way in to which the Dornin argues that the collapse of the Soviet Union occurred ~~was~~ the reduction due to the ~~collapse~~ ^{fall} of communism in 1989 was due to the lack of force. This can be seen as Dornin states that nationalism ~~was~~ struggled to be controlled 'based on the threat of coercion' as it meant that the USSR could not force its will on others.

This could be seen with ~~Lithuania~~ Nagorno-Karabakh in 1988 and the Tbilisi massacre in 1989, where 19 were killed by Soviet soldiers. This caused even more uproar in the republics as they saw the result of the Soviet doctrine in Eastern Europe and believed that they should be receiving the same treatment as the Eastern bloc countries. Dorian further this as he states due to the fall of Eastern bloc 'the Soviet Republics now demanded their freedom!'. As a result of elections and the lack of force that the Gorbachev was willing to use, it meant that Nationalism had the perfect space to grow and ~~could be~~ ^{resulted} in the announcement of independence of Lithuania in March 1990. This shows Dorian is convincing as Lithuania's own independence was announced less than 6 months after the fall of the Eastern bloc and could be seen as a result of growing nationalism which was able to occur due to the lack of force from Gorbachev, as Dorian alludes to.

Alongside this, Dorian also ~~suggests~~ ^{alludes} to the distrust felt towards the Soviet government. This is seen when Dorian says 'The abuses devastated the authority and the legitimacy of the

On the other hand, Ashraf also disputes this as he suggests that the USSR collapsed due to a weak economy. This can be seen as he states 'economic growth never exceeded 2.3 per cent a year, which probably meant economic stagnation in reality'. This alludes to the ^{GDP} ~~economic~~ deficit that ~~is~~ increased from 2.4% to 6.2% during the 12th Five Year Plan and oil production dropped by 9% during this time. This shows that the economy was terribly weak and was further exacerbated as a result of the price of an oil barrel dropping from ~~\$70~~ \$70 to \$20 in 1985 making the USSR's pricing export a lot cheaper therefore causing less money to come in and for them to be ~~less~~ ^{in a weaker} economy. Domin further backs this by stating that 'what Moscow could offer by way of economic rewards was poor'. This suggests that the central Soviet government ~~was~~ did not have the leverage of economics to help keep the Union together. This is convincing as this means that the resurgence of nationalism was not here occurred primarily due to ~~the~~ fall of the eastern Bloc but rather due to factors ~~from~~ ^{from} within the Soviet Union that affected them directly.

like a poor economy which could have made everyone's living standards decline massively.

In addition to this, Ashford also argues that Gorbachev's own mistakes caused the collapse of the USSR. This can be seen as he states that ~~it~~ ^{it} affected 'the very functioning of the Soviet state'. This is convincing as ~~is~~ Gorbachev repealed Article 6, removing the party's political monopoly and then he made himself president in 1990. This undermined him completely as it meant that his powerbase was weakened and his power was not legitimated thereby increasing the likelihood that people could challenge him. Ashford justifies this by saying 'glasnost could not be controlled'. This is convincing as it shows that due to the excessiveness of reforms that Gorbachev had no real power. This could be seen with Yeltsin becoming Russian president in 1989 with 57% of the vote against the the communist party's candidate, Alexander Lukashin's 19%. This meant that many ~~perceived~~ ^{viewed} Yeltsin as the legitimate leader and Gorbachev was not very well supported thereby meaning that Gorbachev had lost control over his

own country and therefore couldn't actually do anything to stop the country from collapsing thereby making this argument convincing.

Overall, the view that ~~rationalist~~ ^{Soviet} go Union collapsed due to nationalist resurgence in the Eastern Bloc is convincing but not the most convincing. This is because whilst other republics may have seen this and wanted independence from the Union as a result, I believe that the biggest factor is the weak economy ^{making} ~~as~~ ^{the} ~~Asians~~ ^{Asians} against the west convincing. This is because the economic issues would have ~~caused~~ ^{created} the climate that allowed nationalism to grow so if the economy was doing well, the republics would have been less likely to secede.



This is an example of a level 5 response. The candidate demonstrates a confident evaluation of the arguments offered by both interpretations. This is done through the successful analysis of a range of issues such as uprisings, distrust, poor growth, Gorbachev and Yeltsin. These issues are integrated with own knowledge to discuss the views; this is clearly seen with discussions on Lithuania, Five Year Plans and Yeltsin. There is a sustained evaluative focus on 'convincing' throughout. This leads to substantiated judgements on the views being given as the claims made by historians are evaluated. This answer was awarded level 5, 20 marks.



The best responses move away from agreeing or disagreeing with the extracts and show an ability to grapple with the idea of 'convincingness'.

SECTION C

Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.

- 5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the USSR collapsed in 1991 because of the impact of the nationalist resurgence in the communist states of Eastern Europe?

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

(20)

The USSR collapsed in 1991 due to a multitude of reasons, primarily reforms introduced under Gorbachev (whether economic or political) that only highlighted pre-existing issues within the USSR, such as the imperialist role or the economic stagnation. The view that the impact of nationalist resurgence in the US communist states of Eastern Europe, however, is by far the most convincing. This view is very prevalent in the work of John Darwin as provided in extract 1. However, it is essential to recognise the issues highlighted in Anders Åslund's extract 2, that largely speaks upon the importance of economic and political reforms to the fall of the USSR.

In extract 1, Darwin suggests the USSR collapsed in 1991 due to Gorbachev's lack of ability to control the rapid changes ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ ~~because of~~ rise in nationalism throughout the Eastern bloc and Russia itself. Darwin outlines how perestroika led to the loss of control over 'Eastern European Satellite governments' as they had to be neglected ~~and~~ ⁱⁿ favor of economic reforms. This view is very convincing.

as 'consumer demand and technological innovation' requires vast sums of money as investment. Gorbachev ended the Brezhnev Doctrine, which cost the government \$4 billion annually to maintain. Although the ending of the Brezhnev doctrine allowed for increased investment in other areas as part of Perestroika, it meant that many Eastern European Satellite governments lost faith in the USSR and this allowed for the rise of non-communist groups as ultimately Socialism was no longer under protection. This led to the collapse in the USSR as Gorbachev lost control over anti-communist uprisings or, as Darwin describes, 'pro-Soviet governments collapsed' and so the basis of a unified communist regime crumbled. Darwin's description of this is corroborated by the 1989 elections in Poland wherein the worker's party 'Solidarity' won by a landslide. This is a clear example of the decline in communist ideology, which undermined the regime of the USSR, leading to its collapse.

Darwin outlines the way in which the USSR was undermined as the vanishing of the European 'outer empire' ~~was~~ 'devaluated the authority and legitimacy of the Soviet regime'. This is highly accurate as the struggle for the region of Nagorno-Karabakh between Armenia and Azerbaijan is a clear demonstration of the loss of ~~the~~ Soviet power and

control over the Union, hence its collapse. When Moscow sent people to assist the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, it only worsened as people became infuriated about the Russian intervention. This therefore perfectly demonstrates that the impact of a nationalist ^{resurgence} ~~resurgence~~ in the Eastern Europe led to the downfall of the USSR and its 1991 collapse as Russia lost its control over satellite states once the Brezhnev Doctrine ended and there ^{were} ~~was~~ no more attempts to intervene when socialism was threatened - thus, Darwin's interpretation is highly accurate.

In extract 2, Åslund suggests two primary reasons for the collapse of the USSR in 1991: Gorbachev's economic reforms and Gorbachev's political reforms. Unlike Darwin, Åslund makes no reference to the role of nationalist resurgence in the Eastern Europe. Å Åslund described the shortages in economic success as being worsened "because tax revenues declined with the anti-alcohol campaign". This is highly accurate as 64,000 roubles of revenue were lost following Gorbachev's anti-alcohol campaign, which is prevalent as 20% of household spending was dedicated to buying alcohol prior to this. This demonstrates that ~~the fall in the USSR~~ economic stagnation was vital to the eventual collapse of the USSR in 1991. In fact, as correctly suggested by Åslund that "Perestroika ~~part~~ fell way short of its main goal", the consumption of the

GDP rose from 2.4% to 6.8% in an attempt to correct economic stagnation. This demonstrates that failings in Gorbachev's abilities to achieve economic growth may have exacerbated the decline in power of the USSR and supports Darwin's ideas that economic shortcomings had a knock-on effect to other ways in which the USSR fell, as had Gorbachev succeeded in ending "two decades of stagnation", perhaps he would not have been required to end the Brezhnev doctrine (a significant consumer of USSR investment).

Ashraf suggests that the USSR collapsed due to the lack of control over glasnost, which introduced heavy criticism towards the USSR and ~~highlighted~~ highlighted the fact that the "Soviet government was no longer sustainable". This is accurate as 60,000 informal groups emerged to express concerns about the key issues of the environment (e.g. corrosion due to Chernobyl) and the unnecessary loss of life that occurred during the Great Patriotic War. This demonstrates that the USSR collapsed as the people were allowed to express their concerns, which undermined the Soviet government.

To conclude, in light of differing interpretations, I think it is very accurate to state that the USSR

colleagues who he is nationalist writing



This is an example of a secure level 4 response. The answer shows a secure understanding of the different interpretations and integrates knowledge to discuss most relevant aspects of the views. A discussion is being had and there is some comparison of issues. The candidate integrates the issues raised with those of their own knowledge and deals with most of the relevant aspects. The inability of the USSR to control states and the failures surrounding reforms are good examples of these. The overall judgement of this answer does lack support but the judgement made at the start is substantiated within. This answer was awarded level 4, 15 marks.

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 (eg 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 reasoning in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about in order to justify their judgements
- 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 – eg a realistic amount to enable a balanced and rounded answer on breadth questions

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Paying little attention to the precise demands of the question, eg writing about the topic without focusing on the question, or attempting 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 (eg looking at other significant issues/consequences with only limited reference to that given in the question)
- Answers which only gave a partial response, eg a very limited span of the date range, or covered the stated cause/consequence, with no real consideration of alternatives
- Assertion of change, causation, significance or consequence, sometimes with formulaic repetition of the words of the question, with limited explanation or analysis of how exactly this fitted 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 demands of the question, as opposed to applying 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, eg consideration of their differences, attempts to compare their arguments, or evaluate their relative merits
- Careful use of own knowledge, eg 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 volume 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 interpretations, eg 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, eg 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
- Arguing one extract is superior to the other on the basis that it offers more factual evidence to back up the claims made, without genuinely analysing the arguments offered
- Heavy use of own knowledge, or even seemingly pre-prepared arguments, without real consideration of these in relation to the arguments in the extracts
- Statements or evidence from the extracts being used in a manner contrary to that given in the extracts, eg 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 polar opposites, again seemingly through expectation of this, without thought as 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:
<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

