



Pearson
Edexcel

GCSE (9–1) History

Exemplars
Summer 2022

Paper 3
Modern depth
study





Contents

	page
Introduction	3
ResultsPlus data	4
Access to Scripts	4
Overview of Question 3	6
Question 3(c)	7
Question 3(d)	16



Introduction

This exemplar booklet has been created using student responses from the summer 2022 examination in GCSE History Paper 3. This booklet is designed to supplement the Examiner Reports published in August 2022, which can be found [here](#).

This booklet covers:

- **Option 30** (1HI0/30): Russia and the Soviet Union, 1917–41
- **Option 31** (1HI0/31): Weimar and Nazi Germany, 1918–39
- **Option 32** (1HI0/32): Mao’s China, 1945–76
- **Option 33** (1HI0/33): The USA 1954–75: conflict at home and abroad.

It is recommended that teachers look also at examples from options that they do not teach, as sometimes they illustrate different points that are relevant across all options.

There are answers from two questions for each option, which have been chosen as they are often questions that students find challenging:

- **Q3(c)** Why interpretations differ
- **Q3(d)** How far do you agree with Interpretation 2

The sources, interpretations and the indicative content are not included in this document, so please refer to the question papers and mark schemes, which can be found [here](#).



Access to Scripts

Use our [free Access to Scripts](#) service to view your students' marked exam scripts. The service is available from results day until mid-December each year, but remember to get your students' permission to use their scripts in advance.

This [case study](#) with a GCSE History centre suggests how you can use Access to Scripts to understand student performance, gain professional development in your department, give you model answers for use in the classroom, and motivate and encourage students.

ResultsPlus data

ResultsPlus and Access to Scripts complement each other. ResultsPlus is a useful tool for analysing your students' performance. More information on its range of features, including a step-by-step guide, is available [here](#).

After each full exam series, we provide the global data for every question on every option: average marks overall and also by each grade. The global data is downloaded from ResultsPlus and tidied up.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	
1	GCSE History June 2022 Results Plus data for each paper											
2	1HIA											
3	Question	Question type	AO	Average score	Max score	Percent		Edexcel averages by grade:				
4	30 RUSSIA & THE SOVIET UNION											
5	Q01	Give two things you can infer from Source A about...	AO3	2.41	4	60.3%		3.04	76.0%	2.65	66.3%	
6	Q02	Explain why...	AO1/AO2	6.18	12	51.5%		10.56	88.0%	8.99	74.9%	
7	Q03a	How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into...	AO3	4.73	8	59.1%		6.69	83.6%	5.76	72.0%	
8	Q03b	What is the main difference between the views	AO4	3.11	4	77.8%		3.84	96.0%	3.65	91.3%	
9	Q03c	Suggest one reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about...	AO4	2.09	4	52.3%		3.41	85.3%	2.96	74.0%	
10	Q03d	How far do you agree with Interpretation [1/2] about...	AO4	8.90	16	55.6%		13.40	83.8%	11.93	74.6%	
11	Q03dSpag		SPaG	2.83	4	70.8%		3.73	93.3%	3.43	85.8%	
12	Total			30.25	52	58.2%		44.67	85.9%	39.37	75.7%	

The spreadsheets can be downloaded from the Edexcel website [here](#): look under the 'Guide' dropdown. You'll need your [Edexcel Online](#) login to access the files – please ask your Exams Officer if you don't have an Edexcel Online account.

Below are extracts from this data, showing how students performed on questions 3(c) and 3(d) on Route 1HIA in the summer 2022 exam series. The extracts give the average marks for all students on each question, plus the average marks for students attaining grades 9, 7 and 4 in the overall qualification.

Please note that, because of optionality, two routes were available: 1HIA and 1HIB, and the data for these is provided separately in 2022. Approximately 80% of students were on the 1HIA route, and 20% on 1HIB; the average marks on the 1HIB are similar.

On 3(c), the overall average was high Level 1; students attaining grades 9, 7 and 4 were on average awarded high Level 2, low Level 2 and Level 1 respectively.

Qu.3c	Total	Avg (all)	%	Grade 9 avge	%	Grade 7 avge	%	Grade 4 avge	%
Russia (1HIA)	4	2.2	52.3%	3.4	85.3%	2.6	65.5%	1.4	33.8%
Germany (1HIA)	4	1.9	47.8%	3.7	92.8%	3.0	75.0%	1.4	34.8%
China (1HIA)	4	2.5	62.5%	3.8	96.0%	3.0	75.0%	2.0	49.3%
USA (1HIA)	4	2.0	50.3%	3.5	88.5%	2.8	69.5%	1.6	39.3%
All four options	4	1.9	48.2%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a



On question 3(d), the overall average was mid-high Level 2; students attaining grades 9, 7 and 4 were on average being awarded low Level 4, low-mid Level 3 and low-mid Level 2 respectively.

Qu.3d	Total	Avge (all)	%	Grade 9 avge	%	Grade 7 avge	%	Grade 4 avge	%
Russia (1HIA)	16	8.9	55.6%	13.4	83.8%	10.5	65.6%	6.8	42.6%
Germany (1HIA)	16	7.1	44.5%	13.0	81.3%	9.8	61.2%	6.2	38.4%
China (1HIA)	16	8.8	54.9%	13.7	85.8%	9.9	62.1%	6.1	38.0%
USA (1HIA)	16	6.7	41.8%	12.7	79.1%	9.0	56.3%	5.5	34.3%
All four options	16	7.1	44.4%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Number of students sitting each option on Route 1HIA: Russia 3,053; Germany 106,849; China 350; USA 17,066.



Overview of Question 3

Section B				
3(a)	8	A03	Evaluation of source utility	How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into...?
3(b)	4	A04	Analysis of interpretations for difference of view	What is the main difference between the views?
3(c)	4	A04	Explanation of a reason for a difference of view	Suggest one reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about...
3(d)	16 + 4 SPaG	A04	Evaluation of a historical interpretation	How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about...?

Questions 3(b), 3(c) and 3(d) are focused on *A04: Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations (including how and why interpretations may differ) in the context of historical events studied.*

Questions 3(c) and 3(d) need to be seen in the context of the overall 'package' that is Question 3. We start with 3(a) asking students to evaluate two sources for their usefulness in an enquiry. Then 3(b) presents students with two different interpretations; these do not necessarily contradict each other, but they do offer different views in relation to the overall enquiry. Students are asked to identify the main difference between the interpretations – this should recognise a difference in the thrust of the argument rather than individual details. Then 3(c) builds on this and asks students to offer a reason why these interpretations differ. Finally, in 3(d) students are asked how far they agree with Interpretation 2. The answer to question 3(d) should show an understanding that when historians offer an interpretation, it is affected by the sources they consult, and the way they approach the specific enquiry.



Question 3(c)

This answer should be based on the difference that has already been identified between Interpretations 1 and 2, and should be supported with evidence from the two interpretations, recognising the role of the historian in constructing the interpretations. The answer should go beyond abstract or generic reasons for historians reaching different views in order to achieve higher marks. Similarly, students are unlikely to be able to offer support from the interpretations for suggestions based on aspects of provenance, such as the date the interpretations were produced or the nationality of the author.

The most common approach to this question is to recognise that historians' conclusions are influenced by the sources they have used and to refer to the sources used in question 3(a) in the explanation. An answer on these lines should be explicit about what view is being offered in each interpretation and how this view might have been constructed using sources similar to those in 3(a). A good answer does not just state that the historians may have used different sources, or 'match' the sources with the interpretations but recognises that the interpretations arise out of research.

Another valid approach is to demonstrate that the interpretations differ because the authors have approached the issue from different perspectives. For example, one interpretation may be looking at a longer timescale than the other, or the authors of the interpretations may be considering the issue from the perspectives of different social groups. The different perspective should be identified and supported with details from each interpretation.

The difference may also be explained in terms of the authors choosing to place an emphasis on successes or failures, social/political/economic issues, or the aims (as opposed to the achievements) of a regime. Here again, it is important to identify the difference and then support it with details from each interpretation.

Generic mark scheme

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A simple valid explanation is offered but displaying only limited analysis. Support for the explanation is based on simple undeveloped comment or on the selection of details from the provided material or own knowledge, with only implied linkage to the explanation.
2	3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An explanation of a reason for difference is given, analysing the interpretations. The explanation is substantiated effectively.



Question (Russia)

- (c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the reasons why Stalin won the struggle for power against his rivals.

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

Sources and interpretations

Interpretation 1: From *Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855–1964* by C Corin and T Fiehn, published in 2015.

Interpretation 2: From *GCSE Modern World History* by B Walsh, published in 2001.

Source B: From 'On the Death of Lenin', a speech made by Stalin at the Congress of Soviets in January 1924. The Congress of Soviets was a meeting of local representatives that had an important role in government.

Source C: From *Memoirs of a Revolutionary* by Victor Serge, published in 1945. Serge was a Russian revolutionary who was a friend of Trotsky. Stalin banned Serge from the Communist Party in 1928. Here Serge is describing Trotsky in the 1920s.

Student A

Interpretation 1 and 2 could have used different sources to reach their conclusions on how Stalin won power because of Trotsky's arrogance. Both men had very good minds but they used their dignity which ultimately cost one of them the position of power but was so rightfully theirs.

Examiner commentary

Level 1 - 1 mark

This answer claims that the reason for the difference in the interpretations could be that the authors used different sources, but there the answer ends. There is no substantiation from the sources and the interpretations to support this reason, so the answer achieved 1 mark for providing a simple, valid explanation.



Student B

(c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the reasons why Stalin won the struggle for power against his rivals.

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

(4)
A reason the interpretations may be different is that they looked at different sources. Interpretation 1 talks about how Trotsky had 'a lack of respect' to his colleagues. This matches up with source C which says 'he did not like listening to others' showing his lack of respect. Interpretation 2 talks how Stalin was a 'clever politician' who made 'great efforts to link himself with Lenin'. This matches up with source B which says 'there is nothing greater than being a member... whose founder and leader was comrade Lenin'. This makes him seem close to Lenin and honoured to be a Bolshevik.

Examiner commentary

Level 2 - 4 marks

This answer clearly recognises that the historians may have reached different conclusions because the sources they have consulted offer different reasons to account for Stalin winning the struggle for power against his rivals, and it explicitly links Interpretation 1 with Source C, and Interpretation 2 with Source B. There is clear substantiation of the explanation with reference to both sources and both interpretations. The answer achieved a mark at the top of Level 2.



Question (Germany)

- (c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the reasons why Hitler became Chancellor in 1933.

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

Sources and interpretations

Source B: From *Inside the Third Reich*, the autobiography of Albert Speer, published in 1970. Here Speer is recalling a number of election rallies held on 27 July 1932. At the time of these rallies, he was a junior member of the Nazi Party. Speer later became a senior member of the Nazi government.

Source C: From the diary of Joachim von Ribbentrop, written in 1933. Here Ribbentrop is commenting on discussions in January 1933 about Hitler becoming Chancellor. At the time, Ribbentrop was a wealthy businessman and supporter of the Nazi Party.

Interpretation 1: From *Hitler's Thirty Days to Power* by H A Turner, published in 1996.

Interpretation 2: From *Hitler* by I Kershaw, published in 1991.

Student A (Germany)

~~One reason~~ One reason why interpretation 1 and ~~2~~ 2 give different views about the reasons why Hitler became chancellor in 1933 was because ~~the~~ the interpretations were written by different authors in different years. For example, interpretation 1 was published in 1996 while interpretation 2 was published in 1991.

Examiner commentary

Level 0 - 0 marks

This answer claims that the date of production is a reason for the difference in the interpretations, but there is no explanation of why this should affect the view of the historian, so this answer did not receive any marks.



Student B (Germany)

(c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the reasons why Hitler became Chancellor in 1933.

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

(4)

One reason why interpretations 1 and 2 differ is because of how they believe sources B and C. Interpretation 1 believes that the deal in source C is why Hitler became Chancellor as once Von Papen convinced Hindenburg Hitler should be Chancellor, there were no more obstacles for Hitler. Whereas interpretation 2 believes in source B where Hitler's grip on the German population, entertaining them so with speeches leaving thunderous applause that Hindenburg would feel pressured to make Hitler Chancellor.

Examiner commentary

Level 2 - 3 marks

This answer clearly recognises that the historians may have reached different conclusions because the sources they have consulted offer different reasons to account for Hitler becoming Chancellor, and it explicitly links Interpretation 1 with Source C, and Interpretation 2 with Source B. There is a good explanation in each case of the way the source provides the basis for the argument in the interpretations, but no explicit reference to the view in the interpretations, meaning that this answer reaches Level 2 but stays at the bottom of the level.

Question (China)

- (c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the causes of the Great Famine (1958–62).

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

(4)

Sources and interpretations

Source B: From the diary of an official of the Soviet Union (USSR). Here he is recalling a private conversation with a Chinese official.

Source C: From a private letter sent by Peng Dehuai to Mao during the Lushan Conference in 1959. Peng was an important official in the CCP who worked closely with Mao. Peng had just visited peasants in his home village.

Interpretation 1: From *China since 1917* by A Lawrence, published in 2004.

Interpretation 2: From a history website.

Student A (China)

Interpretation 1 talks about false reports of grain production, whereas interpretation 2 talks about natural disasters. Both sources give weight to different evidence - Interpretation 1 provides evidence from a book, whereas interpretation 2 provides evidence from a history website. Both sources are partial, which means there could be more to them. As they're partial, we don't know the rest of the information they provide.

Examiner commentary

Level 1 - 1 mark

This answer recognises that the interpretations are different because they have given weight to different sources, but no details are offered to support this. The answer then states that the interpretations are different in origin, but there is no explanation of why this should mean that these authors reached different views. The comment that both interpretations are partial does not explain why they differ. This answer received one mark for the recognition that the difference in the interpretations is linked to the sources the authors have consulted.



Student B (China)

(c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the causes of the Great Famine (1958–62).

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

One reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views ^{about} ~~the~~ the causes of the Great Famine is because they give weight to different sources. Interpretation 1 gives the view that Mao and his ideas were the main reason for the Famine, suggesting that it gave more weight to Source C. Interpretation 2 gives the view that natural disasters were the main reason for famine, suggesting it gave more weight to Source B. The views of the interpretations therefore differ because more weight is given to different sources. ⁽⁴⁾

Examiner commentary

Level 2 - 3 marks

This answer clearly recognises that the historians may have reached different conclusions because the sources they have consulted offer different reasons to account for the Great Famine, and it explicitly links Interpretation 1 with Source C, and Interpretation 2 with Source B. There is a good explanation in each case of the argument in the interpretations, but no explicit reference to details in the sources that support the view in the interpretations, meaning that this answer reaches Level 2, but stays at the bottom of the level.



Question (USA)

(c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the methods used by the Black Panther movement.

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

(4)

Sources and interpretations

Source B: From a television interview with Bobby Seale in 1988. Bobby Seale was one of the people who created the Black Panther Party. Here he is commenting on an event which happened just after the Black Panther Party had been started in 1966.

Source C: From an article in *The Black Panther*, published in 1969. *The Black Panther* was the official newspaper of the Black Panther Party and was sold in cities across the USA.

Interpretation 1: From *Rethinking the Black Freedom Movement* by Y Williams, published in 2016.

Interpretation 2: From *On the Ground: The Black Panther Party in Communities across America* by J L Jeffries, published in 2010.

Student A (USA)

They both use different sources to get their interpretations, and are published at different times. Interpretation 1 is from 'Rethinking the Black Freedom Movement' whereas interpretation 2 is from 'On the Ground: The Black Panther Party in Communities across America'. ~~One~~ Interpretation 1 focuses on the violent aspect of the Black Panther party. Interpretation 2 focuses on the non-violent aspect of the Black Panther party and helping ^{the} community.

Examiner commentary

Level 1 - 2 marks

This answer claims that the reason for the difference in the interpretations could be that the authors used different sources, or that they were published at different times, or that they have a different focus. All of these are simple reasons, putting the answer into Level 1. The last point about the focus being different is slightly more developed, thus the answer achieves a high Level 1 mark.



Student B (USA)

- (c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the methods used by the Black Panther movement.

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

(4)

Historians place different emphasis on different sources. For example, the writer of interpretation ~~one~~ 1 believes that the B.P.P. strived to end police brutality as their main goal. They may have been looking at source B which says "there's not going to be any more police brutality." ^{However,} the writer of interpretation 2 believes that improving the basic needs of the black community was their main goal. They may ~~have been~~ have been looking at Source C which says, "We created a 'Free Breakfast for School Children' scheme."

Examiner commentary

Level 2 - 4 marks

This answer clearly recognises that the historians may have reached different conclusions because the sources they have consulted offer different views about the methods used by the Black Panther movement, and it explicitly links Interpretation 1 with Source B, and Interpretation 2 with Source C. There is clear substantiation of the explanation with reference to both sources and both interpretations. The answer achieved a mark at the top of Level 2.



Question 3(d)

This question is the culmination of the question 3 'package'. In questions 3(a), 3(b) and 3(c), students should have recognised that historians may reach different conclusions on an issue and that these views can be valid. Now, students are asked to explain how far they agree with Interpretation 2. They need to understand that they are not being asked to evaluate the interpretations for reliability or usefulness but to consider how far Interpretation 2 is valid.

High level answers are expected to identify the overall argument in Interpretation 2 and consider whether the evidence suggests that view is convincing. This should involve an explanation of how that view is created in the interpretation, and should use own knowledge to confirm or challenge the details. Interpretation 1 should also be reviewed and used in an evaluation of Interpretation 2. The question rubric states that **both** interpretations should be used in the answer and the mark scheme explicitly refers to interpretations at Level 2 and above. An answer that only discusses Interpretation 2 is limited to Level 1 for that strand in the mark scheme. However, the best-fit approach assesses each strand of the mark scheme separately and it possible for the final mark to be higher if the performance is strong in other strands of the mark scheme.

There is no expected structure to be used in an answer, but students often approach this question by giving reasons why they agree with Interpretation 2 and then reasons why they disagree, incorporating Interpretation 1, before offering an overall judgement. This is a valid approach, but it should be noted that the focus of the question is how convincing the student finds Interpretation 2. In high level answers, students have often planned their answer so that there is a consistent line of reasoning, and evaluation and judgement are generally not left until the conclusion.

When substantiating their judgement, it is likely that there will be aspects of Interpretation 2 that the students challenge, and there may be aspects of Interpretation 1 that they find convincing, but the overall judgement that should be made is about Interpretation 2. In a high level answer, a line of argument is developed consistently throughout the answer, showing that the evidence has been weighed. This can be seen when students use phrases such as '*despite the fact that ...*', or when they explain the criteria they are using to reach a judgement, for example '*this was not as significant because...*'

Students should also realise that the question is not an open-ended one that asks what answer to the enquiry students would offer. Own knowledge should be integrated into the evaluation of the interpretations, confirming or challenging the thrust of the argument or key details, rather than being offered as a separate point or an alternative view.

For the highest marks, students should show awareness of the way the different views in the interpretations have been conveyed. This may have been done through the use of language, the tone adopted, the emphasis within the interpretations, or the selection or deployment of details.



Generic mark scheme

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Answer offers simple valid comment to agree with or counter the interpretation. Limited analysis of one interpretation is shown by selection and inclusion of some detail in the form of simple paraphrase or direct quotation. Generalised contextual knowledge is included and linked to the evaluation.
2	5-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Answer offers valid evaluative comment to agree with or counter the interpretation. Some analysis is shown in selecting and including details from both interpretations to support this comment. Some relevant contextual knowledge is included and linked to the evaluation. An overall judgement is given but its justification is insecure or undeveloped and a line of reasoning is not sustained.
3	9-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Answer provides an explained evaluation, agreeing or disagreeing with the interpretation. Good analysis of the interpretations is shown indicating difference of view and deploying this to support the evaluation. Relevant contextual knowledge is used directly to support the evaluation. An overall judgement is given with some justification and a line of reasoning is generally sustained.
4	13-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Answer provides an explained evaluation reviewing the alternative views in coming to a substantiated judgement. Precise analysis of the interpretations is shown, indicating how the differences of view are conveyed and deploying this material to support the evaluation. Relevant contextual knowledge is precisely selected to support the evaluation. An overall judgment is justified and the line of reasoning is coherent, sustained and logically structured.



Question (Russia)

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the reasons why Stalin won the struggle for power against his rivals?

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

(16)

Student A (Russia)

I agree with interpretation 2 to the main extent. I think this because ~~on~~ the ~~idea~~ whole interpretation is all about all the good things about Stalin. As we all know Stalin was loved and worshiped by all which gave him the upper hand in gaining power over his rivals. ~~the~~ Further more, in interpretation 1 near the end it says "trotsky also suffered from ill health". This means that trotsky was not fit enough to deal with any political arguments but on the other hand Stalin was fit and healthy meaning he can deal with whatever is thrown at him.

Following on, another reason why I agree with interpretation 2 is because from what I know, trotsky always wanted things to happen fast and he was impatient but with Stalin he is patient and is careful with any move he makes. We are shown this at the beginning of interpretation 2, where it says "Stalin was a clever politician who planned his attempt to gain power carefully".

my final reason ~~was~~ for me agreeing with interpretation 2 is in interpretation 1 we are told that trotsky treated his colleagues with lack of respect and because of this he was not liked. But with Stalin, we are told that he seemed to understand the feelings of the people.

Examiner commentary

Level 2 - 7 marks, plus 2 marks for SPGST

The answer offers valid evaluative comment to agree and counter the interpretation. Some analysis is shown in selecting and including details from both interpretations to support this comment. There is some generalised contextual knowledge included and linked to the evaluation. This met the requirements for Level 2. As the contextual knowledge is not that strong, the answer was placed in the middle, rather than the top of the level.

Student B (Russia)

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the reasons why Stalin won the struggle for power against his rivals?

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

(16)

Interpretation 1 thinks that the reason Stalin won the power struggle was down to the emergence of Trotsky and the disdain people had for him. Interpretation 2 believes it ~~to be~~ ^{that} the strengths and intelligence of Stalin allowed him to gain power. Personally, I strongly agree with interpretation 2 as it is able to convincingly convey Stalin's strengths as the reason he gained power.

Interpretation 2 mentions that Stalin took on "boring but important jobs." This is strengthened by the fact Stalin was in fact General Secretary, but however, he could appoint his allies to key positions in the party. Stalin was also ~~not~~ known as 'The grey blur' which led to him gaining power as he was the unsuspected candidate and his 'boring' role made it easier for him to remove rivals. The interpretation also mentions that Stalin "made great efforts to link himself with Lenin." This is solidified by the fact that as general secretary, Stalin organised Lenin's funeral and made sure he was seen to be a long-time friend of Lenin, when realistically, they never got on. ~~So~~ Through Stalin's use of propaganda, thanks to agitprop, Stalin was able to ~~the~~ ^{the cult of} Lenin was established which made everyone realise the importance of Lenin after his death.

To top it all off, St. Petersburg was renamed to Leningrad, which made all the general population believe that the two individuals got on very well. Overall, I am still more convinced by Interpretation 2 as it very clearly makes the link between Stalin's ~~intelligence~~ ^{intelligence} demonstrates how Stalin's intelligence led to his victory.



Despite Interpretation 1 being less persuasive of the two, it still contains useful information. Interpretation 1 mentions that "Trotzky was arrogant." This is strengthened by the fact that Trotzky was more going to focus on himself than the country, it he wanted to power, he was insisting on permanent revolution which worried all that he was not going to invest his time in reforming the USSR.

Interpretation 1 also mentions that "they also doubted his loyalty." This explained by the fact that Trotzky established a group, The left communists, and he. This was a group of people who also wanted permanent revolution, an unpopular idea, but this also went against Lenin's ban on factionalism which made him look disloyal. Once again, I am still more convinced by Interpretation 2 as it explains why ~~Lenin's~~ Stalin's strength was his power whilst this interpretation is not able to link Stalin gaining power and Trotzky's arrogance.

Examiner commentary

Level 4 - 15 marks, plus 4 marks for SPGST

The answer starts by summing up the key elements of both interpretations before the student decides that they 'strongly agree' with Interpretation 2. The answer then selects extracts from Interpretation 2 and uses contextual knowledge to assess the accuracy of these details, and by implication, the accuracy of the interpretation.

The view of Interpretation 1 is then reviewed and its accuracy is assessed using contextual knowledge. Both interpretations have been reviewed and evaluated, as can be seen in comments that the view in Interpretation 2 is 'strengthened' and 'solidified'. Contextual knowledge is integrated into the evaluation and a consistent line of reasoning leads to a substantiated judgement. This answer meets the requirements for Level 4 but was not placed at the top of the level as it doesn't explain different ways the views are conveyed.



Question (Germany)

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the reasons why Hitler became Chancellor in 1933?

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

(16)

Student A (Germany)

I agree with Interpretation 2 about the reasons why Hitler became Chancellor to some extent.

One reason why I agree with Interpretation (Int.) 2 is because of von Papen. Von Papen was Chancellor of Germany ^{in 1932} until von Schleicher replaced him a few months later. ~~Not~~ Von Papen ~~was~~ thought that von Schleicher persuaded Hindenburg to replace him, and he wanted to get back into the government, so he made a deal with Hitler. The deal was that if von Papen could persuade Hindenburg to make Hitler Chancellor, Hitler would make him Vice-Chancellor. Von Papen was able to "overcome the ~~ex~~ elderly president's doubts" about Hitler and persuaded him to appoint Hitler as Chancellor. This meant that Hitler was now Chancellor due to von Papen's persuasion, therefore this is a reason why

Hitler became Chancellor in 1933.

However, one reason I disagree ~~that~~ with Interpretation 2 about the reason why Hitler became Chancellor is because of the support of the Nazi Party. After the Great Depression, in 1929, the German people lost hope in democracy and wanted to return



to a dictatorship'. Between 1929 and 1932, ~~the~~ the nazis gained more and more support, only just loosing out to Hindenburg in the presidential elections. In 1932, ~~he~~ "Hitler was in charge of a massive movement of 800,000 party members" which meant that it was posing as more and more of a threat to Hindenburg. Hitlers mass support meant that Hindenburg was almost forced to give Hitler the chancellorship. Therefore, this is a reason why Hitler became chancellor in 1933.

~~Further to this, another reason I disagree with~~

In conclusion, I ~~disa~~ agree to some extent ~~that~~ with interpretation 2 on ~~the~~ the

reasons why Hitler became chancellor, However, I mostly disagree due to the strength and support of Hitlers nazi party.

Examiner commentary

Level 2 - 8 marks, plus 2 marks for SPGST

The answer uses contextual knowledge to explain the role of von Papen in Hitler becoming Chancellor. The link to Interpretation 2 is left implicit until the bottom of the first page, where some details from Interpretation 2 are selected and included in the explanation. Contextual knowledge is then used to challenge the view in Interpretation 2 and use is also made of a detail from Interpretation 1.

The answer was awarded a mark at the top of Level 2. It offers a valid comment explaining the student's evaluation of Interpretation 2, some details have been selected and included from each interpretation, and contextual knowledge has been linked to the evaluation. A judgement is stated in the conclusion, but a line of argument has not been sustained.



Student B (Germany)

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the reasons why Hitler became Chancellor in 1933?

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

(16)

I agree with Interpretation 2 to ~~some~~ ^{a large} extent because it talks about huge support for the Nazis, particularly for Hitler from the German population. 'Mass support ~~for~~ gave Hitler a key to unlocking the door to power' ~~suggests~~ ^{suggests} that the main reason for Hitler becoming Chancellor in 1933 was support from the public. To a large extent, I agree with this because Hitler's charming, intelligent personality allowed him to win over large crowds (his public speaking increased membership massively) and even to win over politicians. Due to this, many supported his ideas and also saw him as a 'saviour' to the country and 'father'. However, the party's mass support ^{from Germans} alone could not gain him the role of Chancellor legally so to ~~some~~ ^{a small} extent I disagree with Interpretation 2.

Interpretation 2 also says that 'By 1932, Hitler was in charge of a massive movement of ~~the~~ 800 000 party members and 13 million voters were generally prepared to place their trust in him'. This suggests that people looked up to the Nazis and trusted them to recover Germany. I agree with this to a large extent because after the Wall St. Crash in 1929 Germany's economy collapsed and many people lost faith in the Weimar Republic, feeling angry and facing hardships. This resentment also linked back to the Treaty of Versailles in 1919 which people still felt was a 'stab in the back' (Dolchstoß). Therefore, we know many people turned to extremist groups such as the Nazis, and

combined with the Nazis' promises to ~~cut~~ reduce unemployment (which was very high at the time) and abolish the Treaty of Versailles, many German people put their trust in Hitler to fulfil those promises and restore Germany. Therefore I agree with Interpretation 2 because it supports our knowledge of people placing their trust in Hitler, and consequently Hitler becoming Chancellor.

I agree to Interpretation 1 to some extent because it suggests that the only reason Hitler became Chancellor was by power 'being handed to ~~to~~ him by the men who controlled Germany'. I agree with this to some extent because without Von Papen and Hindenburg appointing him Chancellor officially, it would have taken a lot longer for Hitler to gain this title legally. However, with the support he had, Hitler becoming Chancellor was inevitable but was sped up by the politicians. He also knew that, ~~they~~ whilst appointing him the role, the politicians did not intend for him to gain much power in the way he did, which suggests it was Hitler's personality and support that gained him power later on and ~~to~~ Hindenburg had little control. Therefore, overall I agree ~~to~~ with Interpretation 1 to a small extent.

Overall, Interpretation 2 focuses on Hitler's support building up to becoming Chancellor by 1932, and the inevitability of him gaining the title, whilst Interpretation 1 only uses ~~of~~ statistics from just before becoming Chancellor in November 1933 ~~and~~ and early 1933, and claims that he had little support and it was greater powers that caused his gain of power in 1933. Whilst I agree that, as Interpretation

1 says, the 'men who controlled' ~~Germany~~ Germany 'handed him the role, I believe that this only sped up his appointment as Chancellor ^{to a large extent} and I agree with Interpretation 2 ^{to a large extent} that 'victory was inevitable'.

Examiner commentary

Level 4 - 16 marks, plus 4 marks for SPGST

The answer starts by saying that the student agrees with Interpretation 2 'to a large extent'. It then summarises the view in Interpretation 2 in the phrase 'Mass support gave Hitler the key to unlocking a door to power' and selects details from the interpretation that develops that view. The answer goes on to use contextual knowledge to assess the accuracy of these details, and by implication, the accuracy of the interpretation.

The view of Interpretation 1 is then reviewed and its accuracy is assessed using contextual knowledge, with the student reaching the conclusion 'I agree with Interpretation 1 to a small extent'.



At the bottom of the second page, the answer shows an understanding that the authors' emphasis and selection of detail in the interpretations has produced the different views in the interpretations. The student acknowledges that there is some validity in Interpretation 1's claim that power was handed to Hitler by powerful men in Weimar Germany, yet suggests the support for Hitler made his appointment as Chancellor *'inevitable'* and the intervention of von Papen only made this happen more quickly.

Both interpretations have been reviewed and evaluated, with the analysis of the interpretations also including an explanation of how the different views are conveyed. Contextual knowledge is integrated into the evaluation and a consistent line of reasoning leads to a substantiated judgement.

This answer was placed at the top of Level 4. It should be noted that a high mark was still achieved even though the student has not properly understood the comment in Interpretation 2 that *'Nazi propaganda suggested that victory was inevitable'* and assumes this is the view of the author of Interpretation 2.

Question (China)

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the causes of the Great Famine (1958–62)?

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

(16)

Student A (China)

Firstly, I somewhat agree with Interpretation 2 as during 1959-61 uncontrollable natural disasters were a big problem in China. These forced communes to be less productive and less viable which leads to less products being grown and made.

However in Interpretation 1 we see that due to false reporting to please Mao more food was sent and for profit as they believed it was in surplus. This shows us how officers lying to keep their jobs led to a nation wide famine which affected them even more.

Interpretation 2 also shows us how as the floods started, all the useable farmland was destroyed. Throughout history we see

events take place where soil is ruined, this means crops cannot grow properly or at all. Methods such as dry farming were implemented to go lower into the ground to grow crops.



Another cause of the Great famine
maybe that with the reasons
making blast furnaces there took up
time and space. They used all those
metal items, and some that may
be used for farms to make
steel. This steel was not
usable as it was brittle and weak.

To conclude I agree that reasons
stated in interpretation 1 were
causes of the great famine of
they had a profound effect on
the food itself.

Examiner commentary

Level 2 – 8 marks, plus 3 marks for SPGST

The answer identifies valid points from each interpretation and supports them with some generalised contextual knowledge. The conclusion states that Mao's policies outlined in Interpretation 1 had a '*profound effect on the food itself*' but does not make a judgement on Interpretation 2.

The answer was placed at the top of Level 2. It offers valid comments linked to details selected from each interpretation and drawing upon contextual knowledge. The judgement is implied but a line of argument has not been sustained.

Student B (China)

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the causes of the Great Famine (1958-62)?

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

(16)

The Great Famine was a period in which around 30-50 million people died due to starvation. This period has been linked to the second five-year plan also known as the Great Leap Forward. The damages done by the Great Famine were felt for a long period afterwards.

There were several notable natural disasters throughout this period which affected crop growth. This has been identified by interpretation 2 as the "Three Years of Natural Disasters". One of the most notable natural disasters was between the period 1959-60 where "many millions of acres of farmland were destroyed by floods". Important areas like Sichuan were heavily affected by this which made grain shortages worse as it contributed largely as there was a lot of good farmland in Sichuan. However, this interpretation doesn't explain the idea that grain shortages were also seen in areas that hadn't experienced grain shortages. One cause that widely affected grain production was the government policy of Lysenkoism. This was introduced to the Chinese public as a policy in 1957. Lysenkoism is a communist

Theory developed by the USSR scientist Lysenko. He stated that seeds should be stored in cold and wet conditions rather than warm and dry ones. He also stated that seeds should be planted very close to each other in holes as deep as 1.5 metres. This resulted in a severe decrease in crop production. However, this was not cited as a cause of the Great Famine by the CCP as it would then

suggest that the government was responsible for millions of deaths due to starvation.

Interpretation 1 supports the ideas presented in interpretation 2 about the 3-year period from 1959-61. Interpretation 1 calls it simply the "three bad years" whilst interpretation 2 references this period as the "Three Years of Natural Disaster". This shows how both interpretations acknowledge ~~the~~ this period as an important cause for the Great Famine. Interpretation 1 however, differs from interpretation 2 by stating that an important reason for starvation was how "peasants [were] being taken away from working on fields" to "produce useable steel" in "blast furnaces". This split in focus in the communes proved ineffective and pointless as much of the steel produced in ~~the~~ backyard furnaces was actually unusable. In 1958 around 50% of the steel produced was through this method meaning around half

of all the steel produced was unusable. Furthermore peasants would have to meltdown any objects they could find to produce this steel which included gardening and farming tools. This meant that not only was there a significant decrease in the amount of peasants working in the fields, but there was also a decline in the tools available to farm.

Interpretation 2 however, also explores this idea that the Great Famine was also caused by 'swarms of insects'. This relates to the ~~policy of Four Pests~~ Four Pests Campaign of 1957. In this campaign four of the largest pests responsible for grains being unusable were targeted. These were mosquitoes, flies, rats and sparrows. This however led to sparrowcide meaning the ~~pest~~ pests that would have been killed by ~~sparrows~~ ^{sparrows} were now more able to ruin grain and crops. This was recognized by Mao and the CCP causing this campaign.

to end in 1959. However, this interpretation also doesn't discuss the 'false reporting of grain production' that is mentioned in Interpretation 1. This was a huge cause of the Great Famine. Officials would exaggerate about crop production in their reports due to

pressure to meet the high targets of the Great Leap Forward. This meant people were under the impression that ~~the~~ grain production was doing better than it was which led to an increase in waste. This led to more starvation and made the impact of the Great Famine worse as people were not only starving but also felt lied to by their governments.

Overall, Interpretation 2 does explore ~~multiple~~ known causes of the Great Famine, however it is very focused on one main cause rather than exploring others which greatly worsened the Great Famine. The ~~topic of~~ ^{interpretation} ~~this inter~~ doesn't explore in detail the failures of the government and how that affected the Great Famine. Interpretation 1 gives a larger range of causes making it overall a better interpretation as the reader is given more information.

Examiner commentary

Level 4 - 16 marks, plus 4 marks for SPGST

The general introduction explains the overall context, but it is unnecessary as it is not addressing the question. However, the answer then goes on to give specific detail from contextual knowledge to confirm the accuracy of some of the details in Interpretation 2. Further contextual knowledge is then given to develop the ideas in Interpretation 2.

As the answer moves on to consider Interpretation 1, the student points out that different terms are used in the two interpretations for the three years of famine. This is then linked to the different lines of argument in the interpretations.



Further analysis of Interpretation 1 is confirmed by contextual knowledge and then the answer considers other points raised by the interpretations, such as the swarms of insects mentioned in Interpretation 2 and the false reporting of production in Interpretation 1.

The conclusion recognises that the interpretations differ in their approach, with Interpretation 2 focusing on the perceived main cause of the famine while Interpretation 1 gives a larger range of causes.

Both interpretations have been reviewed and evaluated, with the analysis of the interpretations also including an explanation of how the different views are conveyed. Contextual knowledge is integrated into the evaluation and a line of reasoning leads to a substantiated judgement. This answer was placed at the top of Level 4.



Question (USA)

- (d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the methods used by the Black Panther movement?

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

(16)

Student A (USA)

Interpretation 2 shows the positive methods used by the black Panther movement.

One good thing interpretation 2 shows is that the black panther party was aiming to improve black lives and they did this by working to, "meet the basic needs of black communities." ~~Methods they would use to do this were~~ Some of the methods they used to do this were, "helping the elderly", "setting up health clinics", and "giving out free clothing". These were all methods to improve the quality of life for black people. These were helpful and not harmful methods of helping.

Another good thing about interpretation 2 is the way the black panther movement started building ~~as~~ a strong, prideful community. One method they would use was, "community support programs" to help people support each other and grow to

together. Another method they used was that, "they taught children about black history and black pride" this helped build a community because it showed black kids how important and good the black panther movement was. It also gave the kids a support system whilst they grew up. Yet again this shows the more positive helpful methods of the black panther ~~move~~ movement.

However interpretation 2 does not show the more violent and harmful methods the black panther party used. In interpretation 1 the writer states, "the BPP carried out armed patrols" this shows that the black panther ~~movement~~ party were prepared for the need or want to escalate to violence. Interpretation 1 also says, "including a shootout in 1967 when a policeman was killed" referring to one of the many confrontations between the Black panther party and the police. This quote shows that the black panther party were willing to use more violent methods to push their movement.

All together I somewhat agree with interpretation 2 as it does show alot of the positive

~~methods~~ methods of the black panther movement, however it does not show the violent extent the black panther party would go. It doesn't show the negative methods the Black panther party used making it seem somewhat biased.

Examiner commentary

Level 2 - 7 marks, plus 3 marks for SPGST

This answer makes a valid evaluative comment agreeing and disagreeing with the interpretation. The student concludes that they 'somewhat agree with Interpretation 2' as it included details about the positive methods used by the Black Panther movement. The justification for this judgment is somewhat weak as there is little contextual knowledge used to support the interpretation and the focus is on omissions in the content of the interpretation. The student therefore achieves a mark in the middle of Level 2 as the answer does not fully meet the demands of the mark scheme.

Student B (USA)

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the methods used by the Black Panther movement?

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

**(Introduction)*

(16)

I disagree with Interpretation 2 to a fair extent because the Black Panther party's main aim was main method was confrontational. For example, Interpretation 2 states that "they taught children about black history and black pride". While this is ~~not~~ accurate, the more common methods used by the Black Panther were violent, as Interpretation 1 states "main aim was to stop police brutality". Interpretation 1 is correct because the Black Panther Party was based on beliefs of ~~black~~ black nationalism, meaning that they ~~disae~~ opposed non-violent direct action because of their frustration at the slow progress. For example, there were riots every summer in Watts from 1965 to 1968 due to repeated cases of police brutality and discrimination from officials and employers. As a result, I disagree with Interpretation 2's suggestion that the Black Panthers were primarily peaceful, because although they helped communities, their main beliefs were centred around black nationalism and confrontation.

In addition, I disagree with Interpretation 2 that the ~~in~~ main ~~extent~~ method ~~of~~ of the ~~late~~ Black Panthers were "community support programmes". For example, Interpretation 1 more accurately states that the Black Panthers were "not afraid to fight back against racism". This is demonstrated by the fact that the Black Panther movement gained momentum in 1965 when the Black Panther members marched into the Capitol with guns. This action is significant because



it shows that right at the start of the movement, the Black Panthers had ~~violent intent~~ more violent intentions than previous groups, and that the publicity around their actions was based on a clear message of confrontation. Furthermore, Huey Newton engaged in a police ~~mass~~ shoot out in ~~1976~~ 1972, which shows the nature of Black Panther methods. The 'Free Huey' movement to protest against his arrest ~~is~~ signifies that the Panthers did not oppose ~~the~~ ^{his} violent methods. Therefore, I disagree with Interpretation 2's view that the Black Panther's methods were peaceful to a ~~great~~ great extent.

On the other hand, it could be argued that Interpretation 2 is correct because it shows ~~the~~ the ways in which the Panthers helped the community. For example, ~~the~~ it

~~State~~ states ~~that~~ that they "worked to meet the basic needs of black communities." This is true because they had strong beliefs in bettering life for black Americans, ~~is~~ especially in ghettos. Their ~~can~~ free breakfasts and health clinics demonstrate this. Therefore it is possible to agree with Interpretation 2 because it ~~is~~ correctly ~~do~~ shows the methods used to help communities. However, the ~~Interpretation~~ Black Panthers more commonly ~~met~~ met the "basic needs of black communities" through patrolling streets and ~~p~~ filling the role of black policemen for communities. While these methods did meet their aim, they were more confrontational and involved the use of armed ~~war~~ weapons as Interpretation 1 accurately states. As a result, ~~I~~ I only agree ~~to~~ with Interpretation 2 to a partial extent because the Black Panther's main methods were confrontational.

To conclude, I disagree with Interpretation 2 to a fair extent because while it does suggest the Panthers were helped communities with peaceful methods to improve the social situation of Black Americans, their main method was violent direct action to combat the white

opposition they faced, and because of a growing frustration in the 1960s at the slow pace of reform as a result of non-violent direct action.

As a result, I disagree with Interpretation 2 to a good extent because it does not show the main motives or methods of the Black Panther Movement.

* Introduction:

~~I disagree with Interpretation 2~~ I agree with Interpretation 2 to a little extent because the methods of the Black Panthers were more violent.

Examiner commentary

Level 4 - 14 marks, plus 4 marks for SPGST

The answer has a clear focus on the interpretation throughout. There is an explained evaluation which comes to a substantiated judgement which mainly disagrees with the interpretation. The student shows, through selection of material from both interpretations and through applied contextual knowledge, that they have fully understood the interpretation and have a clear view about the methods of the Black Panther movement. The line of reasoning is sustained and logically structured. The mark is in mid Level 4 (rather than top) as the answer does not fully indicate how the differences in view are conveyed.