

Examiners' Report

June 2025

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 <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 1HI0_30_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Introduction

Examiners commented that most candidates 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.

This year, there was a change to the examination paper and candidates were able to choose from two options for question 2. This allowed for a wider range of content to be covered and allowed more candidates to attempt an answer.

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 candidates, having explored the utility of the provided sources, analyse the different views presented in the interpretations and the reasons for those differences, and are then invited to judge the extent to which they agree with one of the interpretations. It is therefore important that candidates appreciate the difference between sources and interpretations, and the focus of different parts of question 3.

In particular, there are still a number of candidates who find it difficult to explain why interpretations differ (question 3c). When they are asked about a reason for the different views, candidates 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 candidates 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.

Candidates 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 candidates of all abilities and full answers were generally provided, showing that timing wasn't generally an issue on this paper.

Question 1

This question requires candidates to make two inferences from a source and it is sometimes regarded as an 'easy' question. However, candidates 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 the impact of collectivisation in the 1930s. There were two marks available for each valid inference – one for the inference itself and one for the supporting information. Most candidates seemed to understand how to make an inference, and most used the content of the source to provide support for the inference. Such candidates tended to make inferences about the lack of food, which could be supported by references to the people having nothing, or the fear collectivisation created in people, which could be supported by references to the soldiers. Some candidates simply re-ordered the words in the source which could not be credited as an inference. A very small number provided their own knowledge about collectivisation rather than making an inference.

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 providing simple descriptions of the source as inferences.

- 1 Give **two** things you can infer from Source A about the impact of collectivisation in the 1930s.

Complete the table below to explain your answer.

(i) What I can infer:

The conditions in the countryside were brutal as the peasants suffered majorly.

Details in the source that tell me this:

'We have nothing, absolutely nothing. They have taken everything away.'

(ii) What I can infer:

The peasants were gripped by fear, as ~~suspicion~~ they had no freedom of speech.

Details in the source that tell me this:

'He looked around anxiously to see that no soldiers were about.'



This candidate has made two inferences about the impact of collectivisation supported by direct reference to the source, so gains full marks.



Inferences do not need to be explained in great detail and a single sentence is enough.

- 1 Give **two** things you can infer from Source A about the impact of collectivisation in the 1930s.

Complete the table below to explain your answer.

(i) What I can infer:

People were starving

Details in the source that tell me this:

"Starving people"

(ii) What I can infer:

Food was taken away
from the peasants.

Details in the source that tell me this:

'~~to~~ Some of the food that
has been taken away from
the peasants.'



Neither inference is valid as the candidate has, in the case of the first inference, just re-arranged words, and, in the case of the second, has copied from the source.



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

Question 2(a)

General comments about 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. Candidates 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.

Specific comments about Question 2a

Question 2a was about why the Civil War broke out in 1918. Many candidates had excellent knowledge and examiners commented on the number of impressive answers. There were also good explanations. High scoring answers often stressed the role of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in alienating support for the Bolsheviks as well as the anger towards the Bolshevik decrees and the immediate impact of the Czech legion.

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 sophisticated linking of the causes of the reasons for the outbreak of the Civil War. 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 reasons for the victory of the Reds in the Civil War. This held a number of responses back as it left little which was rewardable within the question focus.

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 2(a) ☒ Question 2(b) ☒

One reason why the Civil War broke out in 1918 was the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. Despite fulfilling the promises set about in the April Theses of "Peace, bread and land" by signing the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, Lenin created disapproval from Russian citizens - especially nationalists who perceived the Treaty as Lenin giving up. This was because the Treaty ~~forced~~ would force Lenin to lose tens of millions of Russians as well as 1 million squared kilometers of land including Finland and Ukraine - which was the biggest source of grain for Russia. They would also have to pay around 600 million roubles in reparations to Germany. Therefore, nationalists were angered by this surrender by Lenin to Germany which caused them to join the White armies in 1918 to fight against the Bolsheviks. ~~Then~~ In turn, helping start the Civil War.

Another reason why the Civil War broke out in 1918 was the opposition to Lenin's early decrees. For example the decree on land which took land from nobles, the Tsar and the Church and gave it to peasants as a way of appeasing peasants and consolidating

power. However, this angered nobles because they had their land taken away from them which would lead them to join the White army in a futile attempt to get their land back if they defeated the Bolsheviks. Many of Lenin's early decrees in December 1917 gained followers as well as enemies who would then go on to join the Whites and help start the Civil War.

A final reason why Civil War broke out in 1918 was the dissolving of the Constituent Assembly. After losing the general election to the Socialist-Revolutionaries (SRs), Lenin dissolved the Constituent Assembly so that he would not have to share dual authority and he could remain in power, however this angered the SRs because their opportunity to rule had been squandered by Lenin which gave them motivation to fight against the Bolsheviks with the supporters to bring back power. Therefore, the Civil War broke out because the SRs wanted to regain power in the Constituent Assembly.



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 the focus of the question is addressed and not just the topic.

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 2(a) ☒ Question 2(b) ☒

Many ~~believers~~ people in Russia, ~~including~~ ~~members of the Bolsheviks~~ including the Bolsheviks' opposition (the Whites), were outraged with the harsh conditions of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. This treaty was made with Germany and saw an end to their fighting, and it was more desired by the Russians who had already suffered huge losses in the war. This allowed for Germany to set these extremely harsh conditions for the Russians to be forced to agree to. Some of these conditions include $\frac{1}{4}$ of their farming land, $\frac{4}{5}$ of their coal industry, ~~as well as~~ ~~hundreds of thousands~~ of people and more. This treaty, although it ended their fighting, was hugely resented throughout the country. This massive disagreement led to the large unpopularity which ~~could~~ contributed to the ~~end~~ start of the Civil War in Russia.

Another cause for the start of the Civil

War was large opposition from the whites, who includes all other political parties who resented how the Bolsheviks came to power. These parties included the SRs who ~~were up~~ had the most votes, the monarchist who were still back by lots of peasants, and more. The Bolsheviks ~~forceful approach~~ ^{gaining} ~~to~~ leadership required force from all the other parties to contest this, therefore starting the civil war.



This response is mid level 3. For AO2 there is some analysis mainly directed at the conceptual focus of the question and a line of reasoning is generally sustained. In terms of AO1, accurate and relevant information is included but there are only 2 aspects of content covered.



The question requires 3 aspects of content to achieve a mark at, or above, the top of level 3.

Question 2(b)

Question 2b was focused on why Stalin was able to establish a dictatorship in the USSR. Many candidates had excellent knowledge and examiners commented on the number of impressive answers. There were also good explanations. High scoring answers often stressed the role of fear through the purges, show trials and use of the NKVD in helping to create a dictatorship. Many candidates also chose to discuss the importance of propaganda in controlling information as well as the steps Stalin took in the 1920s to attain power.

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 reasons why Stalin was able to create a dictatorship. 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 description without any direct explanation of why the issues mentioned led to Stalin being able to create a dictatorship.

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 2(a) ☒ Question 2(b) ☒

~~One reason why Civil War broke out in 1918 was because~~

One reason why Stalin was able to establish a dictatorship was through use of the purges. The purges began in ~~1932~~ 1932 and ~~was~~ Stalin used terror to remove opposition and threats to his power. ~~He~~ Firstly, he used the secret police, called the NKVD, to establish control. ~~on~~ The secret police were known as the Black Ravens to many because they drove around at ~~a~~ night in black cars. They had unlimited power so they could easily remove any threats to Stalin or opponents. They could send people to labour camps, imprison people or even execute people on the spot. ~~They did not~~ During the purges, Stalin used his power ~~and~~ but also the NKVD to remove opponents. For example, in 1936, he ~~got~~ managed to remove Kamenev, ~~because~~ because he criticised Stalin's economic policies. ~~He~~ He used ~~that~~ the NKVD to also arrest or imprison anyone who opposed his plans of collectivisation or industrialisation. This allowed him to maintain ^{also} gun control over the economy. As ~~well~~ the NKVD ^{also} used a system of informers and spies so no one was safe from them, this helped to terrify everyone into

obedience. In the purges, Stalin also used labour camps, known as Gulags, to force people to do hard ~~the~~ manual labour. It was ~~a~~ a punishment for many. At these Gulags, 13 million people died from ill-treatment. This would have encouraged loyalty and obedience due to fear, enabling Stalin to establish control. Show trials between 1936-38 also allowed him to ~~to~~ get rid of any threats because he forced people to confess to crimes due to torture and intimidation.

Another reason ~~that~~ why Stalin could establish a dictatorship is through his use of the cult of personality in the 1930's. He used this to glorify himself and ~~not~~ encourage the USSR population to look up to him and see him as the only leader. He used ~~a~~ lots of different forms of propaganda to do this. For example, he made sure his name was everywhere such as renaming streets on him, newspapers and writers writing about him. This made everyone see him a god-like ~~and not want to be~~. Stalin also received nicknames such as the 'Man of Steel' which made people understand his importance and power. Other forms of propaganda included ~~a~~ things like

free housing benefits to those who were loyal to him which helped him to secure control over people.

Finally, he even faked history by ~~changing~~ changing photos to emphasise that he had a close relationship with Lenin. Lenin was an admired leader so people would ~~begin~~ begin to support Stalin even more, increasing Stalin's popularity and further confirming his dictatorship.

A final reason is that Stalin also made ~~of~~ social changes which confirmed his control over lots of aspects of society ^{such as culture}. For example, ~~the Union of Soviet Writers~~ he set up the Union of Soviet ^{Writers} in 1932 which made sure all writers would write for the purpose of propaganda for the state. All writers and artists also belonged to the Russian Association of Proletarian Writers. This made sure no writers deviated from the proletarian line. Stalin ensured that all this ~~the~~ culture was about his achievements and the development of communism. This also meant criticism of him could not happen ^{so there was little} ~~and he had~~ little opposition. He also censored work heavily and ensured there was little knowledge of the outside world, showing his control over culture. He also even controlled religion. For example, he destroyed 60000 places of worship.



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.



It is a good idea to start each paragraph with a link to the question.

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 2(a) ☒ Question 2(b) ☒

The reason why Stalin was able to establish a dictatorship in the USSR had many reasons. He had good connections, ~~executer~~ he killed other candidates and manipulated people with Propaganda. This made him look good in many ways.

In the Bolshevik government he was a Secretary which meant that he was able to give jobs to people, especially to the people who supported him. When Lenin died the following leader should have been Trotsky but because of Trotsky's mistakes he made, he made himself look really stupid and disrespectful for example not showing up to Lenin's funeral. Through the help from other candidates, they made sure the Trotsky is not becoming the next leader. So Stalin ended up being the next leader of the USSR.

When Stalin had power he used it to start doing purges from the help of the secret police (cheka). He ended up

killing all his political opponents, also the other candidates who worked at first together with him. He feared that they are trying to ~~over~~ overthrow him. In addition everyone who was against him disappeared, got shot or executed. This was one of the main reasons why he was able to establish a dictatorship in the USSR because everyone was scared to speak up against him.

Another thing what ~~he~~^{Stalin} did to protect his position was using propaganda. Everywhere where people went were photos of him where he looks good on them. Most of the photos and posters showed that he played a significant role in the October Revolution. In addition he started doing trials and made them public. ~~Before~~ Before the trials the victims got physically and psychologically tortured to confess everything they did and to say that they ^{are} guilty. The ~~re~~ victims mostly confessed everything because they got scared that they would do something to their family's. This made Stalin look good and ~~was~~ justified that Stalin has the right

to execute those people.

In conclusion Stalin was able to establish the dictatorship because he gained a lot of support from his people by using propaganda and ~~more things~~ making him look ~~got~~ good. Also by ~~using~~ removing his opponents who could threaten his position.



This response achieved the top of level 3. There is plenty of accurate and relevant detail included, and the answer gives some explanation and analysis.



Relevant information should be used to support the analysis.

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) candidates are expected to evaluate the usefulness of the content, taking account of the provenance of the sources and applying contextual knowledge in making judgements about the utility of the sources as evidence for the specific enquiry, in this case the impact of the First World War on Tsarist Russia. These strands in the mark scheme are linked and should be dealt with together, rather than in isolation.

Candidates 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 unhappiness with the Tsar's leadership of the war. This was often backed up by contextual knowledge about the lack of experience the Tsar had in military decision-making and his absence from Petrograd leading to the Tsarina taking control.

There were also good comments made about the provenance of the sources, for example that Source B was from a close confidante of the Tsar who would not be expected to criticise him, thus making his comments useful. When analysing Source C some candidates made simplistic comments about photographs being staged.

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. Candidates 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 the economy was impacted by the war' – 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 critical comments in a letter written by someone close to the Tsar, Source B, and made points which were not joining up the content of the source to its provenance. This

did not prevent candidates from reaching level 3, but it suggested that many 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 candidates 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.

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.

3 (a) Study Sources B and C.

[CRAC] x2

How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into the impact of the First World War on Tsarist Russia?

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

(8)

Source B is very useful for an inquiry into the impact of the first world war on Tsarist Russia because it outlines the economic and social effects on ~~the~~ Russia. It is reliable because it was written by a close friend of the Tsar, in the time of Russia's involvement in world war 1. I know it is accurate because I knew that the war caused the price of living in Petrograd to increase by 300%, and ~~reported~~ caused the poor to become even more destitute. Therefore, source B is useful because it accurately depicts the social impacts of the war due to the failures of the Russian army during 1917,

Source C is very useful for this inquiry because it shows the people of Russia getting their food rations during the world war. It is reliable because it is a photograph of Petrograd during 1917, showing us the poor state of Russia.

It is accurate because I know that bread rations in 1917 decreased from 1.2kg to 0.8kg per person. Therefore, source C is useful because it shows the distribution spread throughout Russia and the economic impact on the people.



For both sources the candidate evaluates usefulness by applying knowledge to test the accuracy of the sources. Provenance is given, but not used to evaluate how this would impact on the sources' utility. Both sources are placed in L2 and therefore it is placed as mid-level.



Evaluate the provenance rather than just repeating the attribution.

3 (a) Study Sources B and C.

How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into the impact of the First World War on Tsarist Russia?

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

(8)

Source B is quite useful for an enquiry into the impact of the First World War. The source says that the unrest in Petrograd was growing due to the 'pressures of war' which implies that people were unhappy due to the impact of the war. This was true, because by 1917, morale of Russian citizens towards the war effort had significantly fallen, due to the failures of the Russian army consistently, on the Eastern Front. Soldiers were sharing guns between two and three men, and there weren't enough workers in industrial cities, like Petrograd, to meet the demand, so the workers that were producing were working longer hours, without any pay rise (due to money instead being spent on the war). It also says that "everything that is decided by [his] advisers makes it more likely Russia will lose the war", which implies that the Tsar and army generals were not effective leaders. This was true because Tsar Nicholas

had no military experience, and army officers were picked based on their nobility rather than their skill, which led to soldiers losing trust in their Tsar and desertion rates tripling by 1917. The provenance of this source makes it more useful because it was a letter written by a close friend to the Tsar, therefore as a close friend, he would want the best for him, and therefore be more inclined to tell the truth about the situation. Source C is also quite useful for an enquiry into the impacts of the First World War on tsarist Russia. The photo shows people queuing for bread, which implies there were high levels of hunger and starvation. This is true, because the war led to price rises between 1913 and 1917 as a result of inflation from the lack of workers in cities. The daily ration of bread went down to 5 grams and the average cost of bread went from 0.35 roubles to 2 roubles, which showed the extent of the hunger and inability to access food that ~~workers~~ workers in Petrograd experienced. However the source doesn't show the difficulties in obtaining and affording other items, such as food, heating and shelter (all of which rose due to the war). The provenance of the source makes it more useful because it was a photo taken at the time and therefore accurate to the time period, however this also makes it less useful as it shows one singular moment.



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. Reasoning takes into account how the provenance affects the content of the sources.



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

Question 3(b)c

In 3b, candidates 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 impact of the First World War on Tsarist Russia 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 were able to score full marks.

It is important that candidates recognise the relationship between questions 3b and 3c. Having identified that the two interpretations offer different views, candidates 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).

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 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 simply stating that 'the author of Interpretation 1 might have used Source B'. They should also try to avoid statements such as 'Interpretation 2 supports Source C' 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 economic or political impacts. 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.'

(b) **Study Interpretations 1 and 2.**

They give different views about the impact of the First World War on Tsarist Russia.

What is the main difference between these views?

Explain your answer, using details from **both** interpretations.

(4)

Interpretations 1 and 2 have different views on the impact of the First World War (WWI) on Tsarist Russia. Interpretation 1 argues that WWI "showed the failings of the Tsars leadership" whereas Source B argues how WWI caused "devastating effects on Russia's economy". This shows how Interpretation 1 thinks that the main impact WWI had on Russia was the political instability it provided due to the Tsars' bad actions while Interpretation 2 believes that shortages of people/workers had the biggest impact on Russia.

(c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the impact of the First World War on Tsarist Russia.

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

(4)

One reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the impacts of the First World War (WWI) because they got their knowledge from different sources. Interpretation 1 may have gotten its information from Source B because Interpretation 1 argues how the failing of the tsar leadership ~~made~~ gave Russia more problems and Source B argues how there ~~was~~ was unrest in Petrograd due to the tsars poor leadership. On the other hand, ~~Source C~~ Interpretation 2 may have gotten its information from Source C which shows the bread/grain shortages caused by WWI and Interpretation 2 also states how there weren't enough people to farm the land during WWI.



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.



Make sure you are able to evidence the reason you have given. It is not necessary to provide quotes as long as you are able to evidence clearly the content of the interpretations and sources as this answer does.

(b) Study Interpretations 1 and 2.

They give different views about the impact of the First World War on Tsarist Russia.

What is the main difference between these views?

Explain your answer, using details from **both** interpretations.

(4)

both ~~styles~~ interpretations A and B are different because they are based on different things, Interpretation 1 is ~~can~~ written about the poor leadership of the tsar. However Interpretation 2 highlights the effect of the war on the economy. both Interpretations are effective to portray the effect of the war.

(c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the impact of the First World War on Tsarist Russia.

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

(4)

~~for~~ Interpretation 1, similarly to Source B focus on the influence and mistakes of the tsar throughout the war. This could be because they are both written by people who had not witnessed the war first hand. Similarly, Interpretation 2 and Source C both highlight the extreme effect on the economy and lack of food. Interpretation 1 and 2 give different views because they are about different aspects of the war.



In question 3b, the candidate has understood the content of the interpretations but has left the differences between them implicit. In question 3c, the candidate indicates that there is a connection between the sources and interpretations, but does not explain that the use of these sources may have impacted on the interpretations.



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 candidates will have already seen how the views in the interpretations are different, why this might be the case and in completing 3(a) have understood that there is likely to be evidence in support of both interpretations. They are now asked how far they agree with one of the interpretations. The strongest answers to 3(d), therefore, focused clearly on the interpretations themselves, reviewing the alternative views and coming to a substantiated judgement. Candidates 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.

Candidates 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 candidates 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 candidates will reach a judgement when answering this question and the strongest 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, merely 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.

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

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the impact of the First World War on Tsarist Russia?

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

(16)

The impact of the first world war on Tsarist Russia was seen to be catastrophic due to the effect within the economy itself and also ~~the~~ society due to growing hatred of military leadership. Interpretation 1 highlights the poor decision making skills of the Tsar, hated by the Russian public. In addition, Interpretation 2 outlines the poor state of the economy as it struggled to maintain efficiency during the leadership of the chaotic ~~and~~ circumstances of the army during war. Overall, I agree with interpretation ~~1~~ as it clearly outlines the poor decisions made by the Tsar at war, leading to devastating effects on Russian society.

I agree with Interpretation 1 about the impact of world war 1 on Tsarist Russia, as it highlights the poor decision making skills by the Tsar as Commander in Chief of the army. For example, the source states, "the decisions made by the Tsar were poor. He was unpopular". This argument is accurate as the army lost 1 million troops by 1916, after his arrival at the army headquarters of Russia in September 1915. This shows the extent of his lack of ~~the~~ military experience, highlighting the direct consequence to his appointment.

as head of the army. ~~In addition, due to the Tsar's~~
~~coming out of multiple military positions upon his~~
~~abdication in 1917, many Russians did not~~ ~~lose~~ ~~lost~~. By
September 1917, the Germans had seized key areas of
west ~~the~~ Russia, forcing 6 million Russian refugees to
flee German occupation, ~~leaving~~ ~~thousands~~ ~~thousands~~ left
homeless. This showed the ~~of~~ devastating effects of the
Tsar's military decisions, further shown as military elites
began to lose respect for Tsar Nicholas II due to the
poor state of Russia. Therefore, the historian is right to
agree that the tactics of the Tsar and his decisions
were poor, leaving his reputation as widely unpopular across
Russia. ~~For~~ ~~this~~ ~~reader~~, I agree with interpretation
1 about the effects of the first world war on Tsarist
Russia.

Whilst I agree with interpretation 1 more, I can support
some of the arguments made in interpretation 2 about the
impacts of the first world war on Tsarist Russia. For
instance, the source states, "Industry was also hit by a
shortage of workers and a lack of fuel and other supplies". This
argument is accurate ~~to~~ as the Russian industry were
starved of raw materials due to the German armies'
blockade of Russia's railway network. This meant that
almost no consumer goods were made, leaving the Russian
people with poor living conditions and quality of life. Moreover,

following conscription of 15 million peasants and their horses to World War I, due to the requisitioning of the remaining crops in 1915, Russia was unable to produce enough crops to feed the entirety of the population, including the Russian army. This meant that bread rationing was implemented in 1917 in Petrograd, leaving many citizens starving due to the lack of agricultural workers in Russia during the war. Therefore, the historian is right to argue that ~~the~~ Tsarist Russia faced significant problems due to the lack of organisation within the country during the first world war, leading to a ~~collapsing economy~~ Russia becoming a gradually collapsing economy. However, the historian exaggerates the state of Russia's economy claiming it to be impossible to move the soldiers, though the Russian army were able to contain the German advancement and move their soldiers to fight ^{with horses, whilst Russian people received rations.} ~~as the war progressed~~. For this reason, I agree with interpretation 1 about the impacts of the first world war on Tsarist Russia.

Overall, I agree with interpretation 1 ~~about~~ about the impacts of the first world war on Tsarist Russia as it highlights the poor decision making of the Tsar, leading to brutal effects and living conditions within Tsarist Russia during the war. However, I disagree with interpretation 2 as the historian exaggerates the state of the Russian economy to be of significant inefficiency ~~during~~ during the war,

despite their ability to keep the supply of food and some consumer goods of some sort to the Russian people and army. Therefore, I agree with Interpretation 1 about the impact of World War 1 on Tsarist Russia, following the poor ~~poor~~ military decisions made by the Tsar as commander in chief of the Russian army. ~~despite their ability to keep the supply of food and some consumer goods of some sort to the Russian people and army~~



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. On page 3, the answer does indicate how the differences in view are conveyed, by referring to the historian exaggerating the state of Russia's economy. Relevant contextual knowledge has been precisely 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.

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

- (d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the impact of the First World War on Tsarist Russia?

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

(16)

~~Mark~~

~~I partially agree~~

I fully agree with Interpretation 2. This Interpretation states that the war had a 'devastating impact on the Russian economy'. This fits with my own knowledge as I know that the war was extremely expensive. To ~~be~~ be able to pay for this, the Russian government printed off more money which in consequence caused extreme inflation. Interpretation 2 also states that their 'transport system was not adequate'. This fits with my own knowledge, as I know that they struggled to supply the front line with supplies such as food and weapons.

However, I also agree with Interpretation 1. This states that the war 'showed the failings of Tsar's leadership'. This fits with my own knowledge as I know that the

Tsar named himself commander-in-chief. This caused lots of anger as he was not military trained and had no experience. He also did not boost the morale of the soldiers. Interpretation 1 also states that 'he relied too much on his wife'. This fits with my own knowledge as I know that when the Tsar went away to war, he left Tsarina in charge. The Russians didn't like this as she was German, they thought she was a German spy. This led to much unrest while he was away.

Another ~~factor~~ impact of the first world war on Russia was all of the ~~revolutions~~ uprisings and strikes that took place. One of those was the February revolution. This was caused by many things one of them including Russia being involved in WWI. The February revolution is where women joined workers on strike. The army was told to shoot the protesters but they refused, creating a mutiny in the army. This caused huge strikes through

Petrograd, and ultimately caused the Tsar to abdicate.

So overall, I fully agree with Interpretation 2. However, there are many other significant impacts of WWI, such as tsars bad leadership and revolutions.



This response achieved level 3 for the analysis of the interpretations and the deployment of contextual knowledge. A judgement was given, but it was undeveloped, therefore this strand achieved level 2. The response achieved a mark towards the top of level 3.



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 candidates seemed well prepared and demonstrated excellent knowledge being deployed to support thoughtful analysis and evaluation.

The following points should be noted:

- 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 candidates 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 simply 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, candidates 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 has 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 candidates should be discouraged from assuming that lengthy answers will automatically score highly. Indeed, candidates 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>

