



Examiners' Report June 2024

GCSE History 1HI0 30

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2024

Publications Code 1HI0_30_2406_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

Introduction

Examiners commented that most students seemed to find the paper accessible and were confident in tackling the various questions. They coped well with the range of question styles, which covered all four Assessment Objectives, and they responded particularly well to the enquiry 'package' in question 3.

Questions on this paper cover all the Assessment Objectives but over half of the available marks are for question 3, which focuses on sources and interpretations. These questions form a coherent package leading to a final question in which students, having explored the utility of the provided sources, analyse the different views presented in the interpretations and the reasons for those differences, and are then invited to judge the extent to which they agree with one of the interpretations. It is therefore important that students appreciate the difference between sources and interpretations, and the focus of different parts of question 3.

In particular, there are still a number of students who find it difficult to explain why interpretations differ in question 3c. When they are asked about a reason for the different views, students should remember that the authors have constructed these interpretations and chosen to present them in this specific way. The most common explanation was that the authors had chosen to place weight on different sources, but it is important to support this with details from the interpretations and the sources in order to meet the mark scheme requirement that 'An explanation of a reason for difference is given, **analysing the interpretations**. The explanation is **substantiated effectively**'. It should also be noted that it is not possible to provide effectively substantiated reasons why the interpretations are different, based on such things as where and when the interpretations were published, unless it is assumed that everyone writing in a specific year shared the same view.

The focus of question 3d is on the interpretations and students who provide their own view of the issue in the question are unlikely to access the higher levels of the mark scheme. Similarly, every level of the mark scheme above Level 1 refers to 'interpretations'. There is no expectation that both interpretations are dealt with in equal depth, but both should be examined explicitly. Answers which only analyse one interpretation can score above Level 1 if they perform well in other strands of the mark scheme but are unlikely to achieve a high mark.

The use of contextual knowledge is an important element in this evaluation, but it must be precisely selected to support the evaluation and not just used to display knowledge of aspects of the topic which the candidate has revised but which are not relevant to the enquiry. Candidates should be reminded that the content from the sources provided may be used to provide contextual knowledge for the interpretations.

Students have already explained the difference between the interpretations in question 3b and will have used this knowledge in their answer to question 3c as they review the alternative views being offered. A feature of strong answers is to show an understanding of how the authors have conveyed their different views. This could be through their use of language, the tone of their writing, their choice of details to include or omit, and their decision of how to present their material. Answers need to show an understanding that the author has chosen what language to use or what to emphasise; they do not need to judge how effective this. This is even more effective if it is worked into the answer rather than left as a stand-alone comment. For example, 'the author presents this as a positive aspect', 'the interpretation focuses on... and omits ...', 'the language is very critical' or 'only including this at the end plays down its significance'.

A full range of responses suggest this question was accessible to students of all abilities and full answers were generally provided, showing that timing wasn't generally an issue on this paper.

GCSE History specification and assessment changes

This note is a reminder that minor changes are being made to the Pearson Edexcel GCSE History specification content and assessment model. Assessment and language changes apply from the June 2025 exam series onwards, and content changes from the June 2026 exam series onwards.

We strongly recommend, if you haven't already, that you familiarise yourself with these changes in time for the start of the new academic year in September 2024. Some options are affected more than others, but all options are affected by the assessment changes.

Below is a link to the summary guidance document, which will help you to find all the specific information and guidance available to help you take on board these changes:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/GCSE/History/2016/Teaching-and-learning-materials/gcse-history-changes-for-2025-and-2026-summary-guidance.pdf>

If you have any queries, please contact Mark Battye, our History subject advisor, at TeachingHistory@pearson.com .

Question 1

This question requires students to make two inferences from a source. Students need to be sure that the inferences they make from the source are not based on their own knowledge as this question assesses AO3 and no marks are available for AO1 (knowledge and understanding). They also need to ensure the inferences they make relate to the enquiry in the question. Most candidates scored well on this question and very few answers gave inferences which could not be supported by reference to the pictures.

The focus of the question was about War Communism. There were two marks available for each valid inference – one for the inference itself and one for the supporting information. Most students seemed to understand how to make an inference, and most used the content of the source to provide support for the inference. Such students tended to make inferences about the reaction of the peasants, which could be referenced by the facial expressions or signs of helplessness, or the force used by the soldiers, which could be referenced by the use of weapons. A small number of students occasionally made comments which were not about War Communism, but were about the condition of the peasants more generally.

It should be recognised that details from the source can only be rewarded if they are provided as support for an inference. No marks were available for students who provided simple descriptions of the source as inferences.

(i) What I can infer:

I can infer that the peasants were not happy with the red army

Details in the source that tell me this:

The peasants shouting at the army soldiers

(ii) What I can infer:

I can infer that the sacks of grain are heavy

Details in the source that tell me this:

where it shows two men struggling to lift it



The first inference is valid and is supported by appropriate evidence. However, the second inference is not valid as it is not about War Communism.



Students should ensure the inference is about the focus of the question.

Complete the table below to explain your answer.

(i) What I can infer:

The peasants disliked war communism.

Details in the source that tell me this:

The peasants look incredibly displeased by the requisitioning, implying how unfair and shocking it was.

(ii) What I can infer:

War communism was very forceful.

Details in the source that tell me this:

The Red Army soldiers carry rifles, implying that they need to be threatening.



This student has made two inferences about War Communism supported by direct reference to the source, so gains full marks.



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

Question 2

In question 2, the focus will always be on causation but the question does not require a judgement to be made or for the answer to prioritise or show interaction of factors and no marks were available to reward such evaluation, however strongly argued. Instead, the most successful candidates showed a consistent analytical focus throughout their answers and many were able to access Level 4 by doing so.

The stimulus points in the question will often be useful reminders to candidates of specific areas of content about which they can write. Students do not need to use these stimulus points but there is an expectation that there will be some depth of knowledge at the higher levels, shown by three discrete aspects of content being covered, although this does not mean candidates need to identify three different causes or events.

A number of answers remained at Level 3, despite excellent knowledge, because they missed the focus of the question. The mark scheme's bullet point for Assessment Objective 2 (analysis) at Level 4 expects an analytical explanation, directed consistently at the conceptual focus of the question. Candidates who responded to the topic rather than the key idea were unlikely to achieve high marks. Those who did reach Level 4 realised that the topic provides the context but that there is a specific focus, which the analysis should address.

In this case, question 2 was about why the Provisional Government was unsuccessful. Many students had excellent knowledge and examiners commented on the number of impressive answers. There were also good explanations. High scoring answers often stressed that the lack of legitimacy of the Provisional Government due to lack of elections, the continuation of the war and the rising significance of the Bolsheviks all contributed to the lack of success of the Provisional Government.

There were a lot of high-quality responses to this question, with even the weaker responses in terms of AO1 and AO2 organising their answer into 2-3 structured paragraphs with an aspect addressed in each. At the top of L4 responses were highly analytical and were able to demonstrate this level through some quite sophisticated linking of the causes of the downfall of the Provisional Government. Responses in lower levels were reasonably successful in describing relevant issues and then providing at least a superficial link to the causal nature of the question.

The main issue which kept candidates at level 2 or below was in chronological confusion, resulting in a significant minority of responses discussing aspects of the Tsarist regime, or blaming problems on Rasputin, or moving beyond the scope into the events of the Civil War. This held a number of responses back as it left little which was rewardable within the question focus.

The Provisional Government failed as they followed in the Tsar's footsteps. As it was WWI at the time, the Provisional Government decided to be involved in the war, they attacked Germany, which led to defeats. This then showed the people that their leaders were not capable of protecting them. The people believed that the Provisional Government ~~was~~ was like the Tsar, it made them believe that they were incapable.

However, as it was a Provisional Government, they had just replaced the Tsar for a bit, until there was a vote for a new leader. But Russia had never had a vote system, therefore it took a while for this to start. And as people demanded food changes as the shortages and bread rationing ~~was~~ was out of control. However, as the Provisional Government was not in charge they couldn't do anything about it.



This response just gets into Level 3 for AO2. There is a good explanation at the end of the first paragraph and there is consistent awareness of how the points relate to the question. For AO1, the answer received a Level 2 mark as the supporting material was accurate and relevant. Overall, the answer received a low level 3 mark.



Make sure each point is explained (not just stated) and try to include precise details to support each point of analysis.

One reason to explain why the Provisional Government was unsuccessful was because of the First World War. For example, peasants and farmers were the main source for soldiers, leaving farms to be unattended - ~~the~~ causing food shortages. Additionally, the decision to remain fighting in the war was highly unpopular with approximately 2 million soldiers deserting the war. Finally, there was a lack of ~~the~~ development ~~the~~ in Russia regarding industries and weaponry. Russia didn't have enough resources to contribute towards the war efforts with many soldiers having to share guns. Therefore, the Provisional Government was unsuccessful because of their decision to remain fighting in the First World War despite the many negative impacts on their image.

Another reason to explain why the ~~the~~ Provisional Government was unsuccessful was because of the Kornilov Revolt (also known as the June Offensive). In which,

the leader ~~of~~ behind the army (Kerensky), believed that the soldiers needed more discipline and encouraged Kornilov to help. However, it became apparent that Kornilov's intentions were to overthrow the Provisional Government for his own control. Kerensky and the Provisional Government had to request for assistance to prevent Kornilov's Revolt. The Bolsheviks and the Red Guards ~~prevented~~ ^{stopped} Kornilov's Revolt by turning many soldiers away and shutting down the railway systems so Kornilov's resources ~~couldn't~~ be accessed.

This explains why the Provisional Government was unsuccessful because of their perceived weaknesses from the Russian population, unable to put their trust in them.

A final reason for why the Provisional Government was unsuccessful was because of their unreliability to keep their promises. For example, one promise made by the Provisional Government was that they would hold elections which had been delayed to ~~November~~ around November. Another promise that they had made was to give back some land to the peasants after the February Revolt, where many peasants expressed this demand. Therefore, the Provisional Government was unsuccessful because of their lack of honesty and ignoring demands from the public.



This answer is fully focused on the question throughout and provides precise and wide-ranging details to support the analysis. The answer achieved Level 4 for both Assessment Objectives.



Make sure you address the focus of the question and not just the topic.

Question 3 (a)

Question 3(a) targets the ability to analyse and evaluate source utility and, in doing so, introduces the enquiry which will be dealt with in further detail in questions 3(b), 3(c) and 3(d).

In question 3(a) students are expected to evaluate the usefulness of the content, taking account of the provenance of the sources and applying contextual knowledge in making judgements about the utility of the sources as evidence for the specific enquiry, in this the experience of women in the Soviet Union under Stalin. These strands in the mark scheme are linked and should be dealt with together, rather than in isolation.

Students found the sources accessible and were confident in showing that the content of the sources was relevant for the enquiry and therefore useful. They could also make a number of points about the significance of the provenance for the usefulness of the content, although sometimes this consisted of basic statements rather than a developed explanation. When considering provenance, generic comments about a source being biased (with no explanation of how that bias could be detected or why it occurred) or about the source being reliable because it came from the time under investigation, could be made without any reference to the individual source and therefore remained at Level 1. This type of generic assumption was seen when some answers assumed that the authors of the sources would be biased or that a source's accuracy would be affected by the passage of time.

At Level 2, developed comments were made about the content of the sources, for example, the evidence source B provided about the conditions of women in the Soviet Union. This was often backed up by contextual knowledge about how Stalin had renewed the focus on the family to increase birth rates as well as encouraging women to work to achieve the Five-Year Plans.

There were also good comments made about the provenance of the sources, for example that Source C was designed to set out the aims of the USSR rather than to show what these aims had achieved. When analysing Source B, many candidates made basic comments about newspapers being biased and exaggerating without considering the content of the source in this explanation.

However, some very good answers could not access the higher marks because they did not include contextual knowledge. Contextual knowledge is mentioned at every level of the mark scheme and failure to include it limited a number of otherwise good answers. Students should recognise that it is not enough to repeat a detail from the source and assert that this can be confirmed from the candidate's own knowledge or to give generalised comments such as 'I know that Stalin treated women badly' – some additional detail is needed as a demonstration of that own knowledge. Contextual knowledge should be relevant to the enquiry and used to assess the source, for example to add detail about something mentioned in the source, to add weight to an aspect of the provenance, to place the source in a broader context, or to assess whether the source gave an accurate view or showed a typical situation.

At Level 3, comments need to consider the effect of an aspect of the provenance on the usefulness of the source content, and contextual knowledge should be integrated into the process of reaching a judgement, not simply provided as information. Many candidates did not see the significance of a critical newspaper article in a Soviet controlled newspaper, Source B, and made points which were not joining up the content of the source to its provenance. This did not prevent students from reaching level 3, but it suggested that many students relied on learned phrases to accompany certain source types.

It is important to note that the question asks about the usefulness of the sources in relation to a specific enquiry. Sources should not be dismissed because they do not cover every detail that might be helpful in an investigation and students should recognise that unreliable sources can be very useful.

Similarly, the focus should be on assessing the usefulness of what is in the source rather than listing details which are not mentioned. It can be valid to note the limitations of a source but these points need to be used in an overall evaluation of the usefulness of the source; an answer which focuses on 'missing' information without weighing the positive aspects of the source, is unlikely to score highly. If the answer identifies omissions from the source as limitations on its usefulness, this could be linked to a consideration of the provenance, showing whether this is the result of lack of knowledge or deliberate omission.

The question asks 'how useful' the sources are, so a judgement should be made on the usefulness of the source's evidence for the specific enquiry. Good answers made clear the criteria being used to assess the usefulness for the enquiry of the sources, weighing the value of the content in the light of the provenance and the candidate's own knowledge. Various criteria could be used, for example accuracy of detail, reliability, the relevance of the source, the way it could be used by the historian, and how representative the source is.

However, there is no requirement to compare the sources or to use them in combination and no marks are available for this. Students who focused on comparisons between the sources often failed to develop their judgement on each source properly; if this approach is used, it is important that the answer still comes to a judgement on each individual source.

Very few answers only considered one source but it should be noted that every level of the mark scheme refers to 'sources' and therefore answers which do not consider both sources cannot access high marks.

Source B is useful to ~~some extent~~ a large extent, this is because ~~it~~ source B is written at the time of Stalin and is about a woman in the USSR and what she had to do to look after her children. Furthermore, it also states 'Party officials have not tried to improve this awful situation' this shows how the Soviet party didn't care for ~~anyone~~ women and wouldn't even try to help them.

Source C is useful to a limited extent, this is because it is from the constitution of the USSR and is not from a real account of what happened. However, this source does show that the USSR did promise to give some help to mothers even if it didn't work. As well as this, it states 'The State will protect the interests of mothers and children' this shows how the USSR did promise to help mothers and children in their constitution, ~~however~~ however, this doesn't mean that the help would be given.



The answer starts as a typical L1 approach, with the basic comment that it is 'from the time' and from a woman and what she had to do. It then makes an inference about the Party's attitude towards women, moving the content strand into L2 but with no discussion of provenance or use of contextual knowledge (L2 overall).

The treatment of Source C recognises that the provenance of the source means it is a statement of policy rather than a statement of fact. It uses the content to say that the source does show how the USSR promised to help women but there is no use of contextual knowledge.

Both sources are placed in L2 and therefore it is placed as mid-level.



Make sure you use contextual knowledge to evaluate the source.

Source B is quite useful for an enquiry into the experience of women because it tells us about the experience of a woman, Mariia, who is suffering under Stalin's rule. It tells us about a childcare centre which didn't 'look after her children', and I know from my own knowledge that the number of childcare centres and nurseries was in rapid decline, so there may have been no other option for Mariia. It also tells us that even when Mariia tried to get a job, childcare was still her responsibility which I again know to be true from my own knowledge, as men's views on family roles did not change very much. Furthermore, this source is written in a Soviet newspaper, and as such, if it were to lie, it would be more likely to lie about how good the life of women was, leading me to think that this source is quite reliable.

Source C also has some usefulness in this enquiry, because it tells us what the intention of the new constitution was. We are told women are given 'equal economic, political and

social rights to men'. Although this may have been the intention, I know from my own knowledge that this didn't really happen, as progressive moves were reversed and even the women's section of the party Zhenobdel ^{had its powers reduced.} ~~was shut down~~. However, although the source doesn't tell us what happened, it is still somewhat useful because it is from the new constitution which was written up by the government, telling us what the government initially intended to do with ~~women's~~ women's rights, even if they later turned their backs on that idea. In this way, source C is useful for this enquiry.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a good example of how candidates do not need to write in quantity to achieve the highest marks for this question. Level 3 is achieved for both sources. The candidate uses contextual knowledge to effectively evaluate the content of the sources, not just as evidence of what they know.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Rather than making several points about the source content, make sure you cover content, provenance and contextual knowledge.

Question 3 (b)-(c)

In question 3(b), students are asked to identify a difference in the overall views being offered in the interpretations; these do not necessarily contradict each other but they do provide alternative views. The answers should identify the key difference but also provide support from each interpretation to demonstrate that difference.

Many answers recognised that the two interpretations offered different views about the experience of women in the Soviet Union under Stalin's rule and could select detail from the two interpretations to support the explanation of that difference. However, some answers simply selected details from the interpretations without explaining how these demonstrated the difference in the overall views.

It is important for candidates to remember that the focus of this question is to identify the differences between the views rather than identifying differences of surface detail as the latter can only be awarded marks in Level 1. Responses which asserted differences without support for example stayed in level 1.

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

It is important that students recognise the relationship between questions 3(b) and 3(c). Having identified that the two interpretations offer different views, students are asked to suggest a reason why these different views have been reached. They should be able to support their answer with reference to the interpretations but they should also make sure that their answer to 3(c) does not simply repeat their answer to 3(b).

In regard to question 3(c), it is clear that candidates have become more confident in answering this question, particularly those who understood that historians use sources as the building blocks to form views and interpretations. These candidates often used Sources B and C to exemplify this historical process.

The focus here is on the process by which the historian produces their interpretation. Where answers suggested that when carrying out research the authors had placed weight on different sources, candidates could easily score the full 4 marks by linking details in the interpretations with details in Sources B and C. However, this should be explained with references to both the interpretations and the sources rather than merely stating that 'the author of Interpretation 1 might have used Source C'. They should also try to avoid statements such as 'Interpretation 2 supports Source B' as this suggests they have not understood the relationship between the sources and the interpretations.

Alternative explanations also recognise that the historian's approach may affect their research and conclusions. For example, whether an historian focuses on quantitative improvement or qualitative improvement, or how broad their coverage is, eg Interpretation 1 focuses on the experience of women as employees, whereas Interpretation 2 deals with women's experience more broadly. Here again, the explanation needs to be supported by the use of the interpretations. Therefore, speculation that the difference in interpretation is a result of their provenance, for example the date that the interpretations were produced, is not valid as it cannot be supported with explicit details. The full reasons for this are explained in the *Getting Started Guide* on pp 43-44. As stated in *Getting Started*: 'Students should distinguish between their comments on contemporary sources and on these texts. Responses based on matters such as the origin or time of production of these secondary works are unlikely to be valid for this question.'

The main difference between these two interpretations is the outlook on how women were treated. Interpretation 1 implies that women struggled and were forced to work as it says "expected to look after their children... as well as going to work... only valued for their work". Interpretation 2 however implies that women wanted to work and had lots of support to do so, as it says "married women continued to work... more child clinics... helped women to cope with work and family."

The interpretations may differ because the historians have used different sources. Interpretation 1 says that women in Russia didn't have "enough childcare" and that there were almost no "women in important positions in the Communist Party". This is similar to Source B which talks about a woman whose "childcare centre did not feed or look after her children" and also says that there is not even a "women's organiser". Interpretation 2 talks about "female industrial workers" and "women in education" and how the government helps "women to cope with work and family". This is similar to Source C which talks about "rights to work... to have rest, education" and how "The State will protect the interests of mothers and children".



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer for question 3b shows clear analysis of the interpretations. A key difference in view has been identified and supported with evidence from both interpretations.

The answer for question 3c has given a valid reason for the difference in view and has been able to evidence that reason from the interpretations.

Level 2 was achieved by both responses.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Make sure you are able to evidence the reason you have given.

(4)

Interpretation 1 tells me the struggles and complications of work, and childcare and how things dropped for the government.

Interpretation 2 tells me the support given to women that is both married and not having help with work, and support with child clinics.

A reason why both interpretations give different views is because interpretation 1 shows what it's really like, working hard and having no-one's help, ~~when for~~ and having struggles. However for interpretation 2, it discusses about how they are given assistance and care to cope with work and family.



In question 3b, the candidate has understood the content of the interpretations but has left the difference between them implicit, meaning the mark remains in level 1.

In question 3c, no valid reason is given for the difference, the answer merely restates the content of the interpretations, therefore no marks are achieved.



Make sure you are showing the difference in views about the enquiry and not simply the difference in individual details.

Question 3 (d)

Question 3(d) carries the highest number of marks on the paper. Successful students will have already seen how the views in the interpretations are different, why this might be the case and, in completing 3(a), have understood that there is likely to be evidence in support of both interpretations. They are now asked how far they agree with one of the interpretations. The strongest answers to 3(d) therefore focused clearly on the interpretations themselves, reviewing the alternative views and coming to a substantiated judgement. Students need to recognise that they are not being asked to treat the interpretation as a source and evaluate its reliability or usefulness but to explain whether they think the historian has offered a valid view.

The use of contextual knowledge is an important element in every level of the mark scheme but it must be precisely selected and linked to the evaluation of the interpretation rather than being offered as an answer to the enquiry question. At the same time, merely asserting agreement with points in the interpretation by saying 'from my own knowledge I know this to be true' is not sufficient evidence of contextual knowledge.

Some answers attempted to discuss the experience of women in the Soviet Union under Stalin without reference to the interpretations. This approach misses the focus of the question, which is about making a judgement on the view offered in Interpretation 2.

Students often used details from Interpretation 1 to counter the view in Interpretation 2. At all levels of the mark scheme answers are expected to analyse both interpretations and discuss the difference in the views being offered, so answers should be explicit in their references to the Interpretations rather than presenting this as their own knowledge. As stated above, the interpretations do not need to be dealt with in equal depth but both should be examined explicitly.

Examiners reported some impressive answers to 3(d) and many students were able to engage confidently with the interpretations, taking a range of approaches. In addition, some of the strongest answers were able to show how the differences of view in the two interpretations were conveyed, for example through the use of language, tone, selection or omission of detail, and emphasis created by the structure of the interpretation.

It is expected that students will reach a judgement when answering this question and the strongest students developed their evaluation throughout the answer, creating a consistently argued response. Less successful answers offered points to support the views expressed in interpretation 2, then used interpretation 1 and contextual knowledge to challenge those views, before reaching the view that interpretation 2 was 'somewhat accurate' or saying that they 'partially agreed' with the view in Interpretation 2. In these answers, there was little sense of evaluation, simply an explanation of the different views, with the acknowledgement that each had some valid points. The strongest answers to question 3(d) therefore focused clearly on the interpretations themselves, integrating evaluation while reviewing the alternative views and coming to a substantiated judgement. Candidates who focused exclusively on the view provided in interpretation 2 and used this as a basis for an essay based on their own knowledge were less successful. The existence of the strands which make up AO4 leads to 'best-fit marking'. All strands are considered before a final mark is decided upon. The most successful candidates, therefore, were able to display evidence of a clear understanding of all three strands:

- The quality of the judgement based on reasoning
- The analysis of the provided interpretations
- The deployment of contextual knowledge to support the application of criteria.

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

I partially agree with Interpretation 2 about the experience of women under Stalin's rule, but more strongly agree with ^{Interpretation} Interpretation 1.

I agree with Interpretation 2 where it says 'many married women continued to work'. I know from my own knowledge that women were encouraged to work in all fields, some ~~be~~ even entering previously male dominated fields like engineering due to an increase in technical ~~and~~ ^{or} orientated education due to industrialisation. This was important as it meant women were responsible for balancing an 8 hour work day with an additional 5 hours of work at home, looking after their family. I agree with Interpretation 2 where it says 'the number of female industrial workers grew enormously'. I know from my own knowledge that the amount of female workers in cities grew from 3 million to 13 million. Stalin's need for rapid industrialisation led to almost no unemployment. This was important

as despite women and men working at the same jobs 'with women making up 43% of the industrial workforce', men did no additional family work at home ~~and~~ ^{while} women did, meaning the workload and ~~stress~~ ^{pressure} ~~was~~ ^{was} stress levels ~~were~~ ^{were} much higher for women. I agree with Interpretation 2 where it says 'growth in numbers of state nurseries'. I know from my own knowledge that state nurseries ~~were~~ and creches were brought in to help women. However they were state funded and were not a massively important thing ^{amidst} ~~amidst~~ industrialization so were low quality, many doing bare minimum or less ~~during~~ ^{directed} towards childcare. This was important as mothers didn't want to leave their children in a place they were ill cared for so the nurseries were on occasion no help. ~~for~~ I disagree with Interpretation 2 where it says 'all helped women to cope with work and family'. The state nurseries were often abused at ~~or~~ childcare leaving ^{children} ~~and~~ hungry and uncared for. Additionally my only ~~men~~ ^{men} during the day so women still had to come for their ~~or~~ children after work and at night. This was important as women still had a higher workload than men. Overall, I agree with the Interpretation about women's increased involvement in work and industry, but

disagree where it talks about the state assistance for mothers and families.

// I agree with Interpretation 1 where it says 'expected to look after their children as well as going to work'. I know from my own knowledge that women ~~to~~ worked 8 hours days like ~~then~~ ^{the} men, but worked an additional 8 hours at home raising their family, which the men did not help with. This is important as despite being encouraged to work and Stalin demanding quick work for his rapid industrialisation of Russia, women had increased pressure as they had to balance their role as a worker with their role as a mother. I agree with Interpretation 2 where it says 'numbers of women in important positions in the Communist Party and the government dropped'. I know from my ~~own~~ own knowledge women were considered politically second class citizens and ~~as~~ despite the Zhdanov allowing them to work as delegates and informants, it was shut down as women's issues were considered dealt with and under Stalin, ^{only} 12.8% of the ~~entire~~ ^{entire} party were women. This was important as women were not allowed to the opportunities politically that men ~~were~~ ~~over~~ were, under Stalin these were limited. I agree with Interpretation 1 where it says 'only valued for their role

as workers' and 'not enough childcare'. I know from my own knowledge that State nurseries were underfunded ^{inefficient as childcare.} and not prioritized due to the ~~the~~ industry being prioritized. This was important as it shows women were not a priority or a concern past their ability to work for the state, as ~~things~~ ^{things} put into place were not truly that helpful and ~~made~~ made no difference to their struggle. Overall, I agree with Interpretation 1 about the struggles faced by women with balancing their work and family life and their lack of priority under Stalin.

// In conclusion, I agree with Interpretation 1 more than Interpretation 2. This is because while Interpretation 2 is truthful about women's increased involvement in work, it is not truthful about the reality of state childcare or the ~~the~~ state's lacking efforts to ~~to~~ improve women's experiences. In contrast, I wholly agree with Interpretation 1 about the struggles faced by women and their lack of opportunities under Stalin and the negative experiences caused by that.



This is a high Level 4 response as Level 4 has been achieved in all of the strands of the mark scheme for AO4. There is a sustained evaluation and a substantiated judgement. The answer analyses both interpretations and deploys this material to support the evaluation. However, the top of level 4 cannot be achieved for this strand as there is no indication of how the differences in view are conveyed. Precise contextual knowledge has been specifically selected to support the evaluation.



Contextual knowledge should be integrated into the evaluation of the interpretation, not offered as information or as the candidate's answer to the enquiry.

I agree with interpretation 2 to some degree about the experience of women in the Soviet Union under Stalin's rule. It states "Large numbers of women worked on the collective farms." This is supported by source C as it says "women are given the same rights to work" [in the new 1936 constitution]. Prior to ~~1936~~^{Stalin's rule}, women would not have physical jobs like farming, however under Stalin's rule it became more acceptable for women to work on farms especially because collectivisation meant that more jobs were available for peasants. Therefore, it is possible to agree with interpretation 2.

It is also possible to agree with interpretation 1. In interpretation 1 it says "women were only valued for their role as workers." During Stalin's rule more women were able to work on collective farms and in education, however not many women ~~were~~ had jobs in politics. This shows that women were only valued for their role as workers because their political opinion was still not valued. *

Furthermore, in interpretation 1 it says "women in the Soviet Union in the 1930's were expected to look after their children and homes as well as going to work." This is supported by source B as it says Maria "had to quit her job ... because the childcare centre did not feed or look after her children" This shows that the experience for women was very difficult under Stalin's rule as they could not work if they had children because of the lack of child care aid from the state.

However it is also possible to disagree ^{with interpretation 1} that women were valued for their role as workers because in source B it says the Party officials "made no effort to keep Maria Semenovna Abramova at work in the factory." This shows that women as workers were not valued.

~~However~~ It is also possible to disagree with interpretation 2. It says "^{many} married women continued to work". However, source B states that Maria "had to quit her job".

Despite work for women being more available in the 1930's it was unachievable to work as well as having children, because of the lack of quality care from the state.

Overall, I agree with Interpretation 2 to ~~a~~ some extent because during Stalin's rule more women were able to work. However, I also partially agree with interpretation 1 because experience for women was still difficult as little help was available with child care.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response achieved level 3 for each strand of the mark scheme. Some justification for the judgement was provided and good analysis of the interpretations was shown. Sources were used as contextual knowledge. The response achieved a mark towards the top of level 3.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Know what your judgement is before you start to write your answer. In this way, you can build up a coherent answer, with a consistent line of reasoning.

Paper Summary

Examiners commented that there were a number of impressive answers where students seemed well-prepared and demonstrated excellent knowledge being deployed to support thoughtful analysis and evaluation.

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

- While there was good knowledge of some topics, candidates cannot rely on knowing just a few key topics and hoping to use that information whatever question is asked.
- Inferences are not the same as comprehension and students should avoid merely describing what they see or re-wording what they read.
- Candidates need to recognise the specific focus of the question so that the information being offered is shaped to meet the demands of the question rather than merely describing a situation or including irrelevant material.
- Candidates should appreciate the difference between sources and interpretations and be aware that interpretations are constructed by historians in order to offer their view of events.
- In all parts of Question 3, it is helpful to be explicit about the source or interpretation being discussed.

Spelling, punctuation and grammar were broadly accurate and many answers used specialist terms with confidence but a poor standard of handwriting made a number of answers difficult to mark and exacerbated the difficulty in understanding a badly-expressed answer.

The SPaGST marks may be affected if there are weaknesses in these areas:

- Appropriate use of capital letters
- Correct use of apostrophes
- Weak grammar ('would of', 'based off of') and casual language, which is not appropriate in an examination
- Paragraphs: failure to structure answers in paragraphs not only affects the SPaGST mark, but may also make it difficult for the examiner to identify whether three different aspects have been covered in question 2, or how well analysis and evaluation is developed in question 3.

If extra paper is taken, students should state clearly in the answer space for the question that it has been continued elsewhere and it should be stated where the rest of the answer had been written; this should be on an additional sheet rather than elsewhere in the answer booklet and should be clearly labelled. However, in many cases where additional paper had been taken, the marks had already been attained within the space provided rather than on the extra paper and students should be discouraged from assuming that lengthy answers will automatically score highly. Indeed, students taking extra paper sometimes ran out of time on the final, high mark question and therefore disadvantaged themselves.

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>

