



Mark scheme (Results)

June 2017

Pearson Edexcel International
Advanced Level in History (WHI02)

Paper 2: Breadth Study with
Source Evaluation

Option 1C: Russia, 1917-91: From
Lenin to Yeltsin

Edexcel, BTEC and LCCI qualifications

Edexcel, BTEC and LCCI qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body offering academic and vocational qualifications that are globally recognised and benchmarked. For further information, please visit our qualification websites at www.edexcel.com, www.btec.co.uk or www.lcci.org.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus

About Pearson

Pearson is the world's leading learning company, with 40,000 employees in more than 70 countries working to help people of all ages to make measurable progress in their lives through learning. We put the learner at the centre of everything we do, because wherever learning flourishes, so do people. Find out more about how we can help you and your learners at: www.pearson.com/uk

June 2017

Publication Code WHI02_1C_1706_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

General marking guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the last candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the first.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed-out work should be marked **unless** the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

How to award marks

Finding the right level

The first stage is to decide which level the answer should be placed in. To do this, use a 'best-fit' approach, deciding which level most closely describes the quality of the answer. Answers can display characteristics from more than one level, and where this happens markers must use their professional judgement to decide which level is most appropriate.

Placing a mark within a level

After a level has been decided on, the next stage is to decide on the mark within the level. The instructions below tell you how to reward responses within a level. However, where a level has specific guidance about how to place an answer within a level, always follow that guidance.

Markers should be prepared to use the full range of marks available in a level and not restrict marks to the middle. Markers should start at the middle of the level (or the upper-middle mark if there is an even number of marks) and then move the mark up or down to find the best mark. To do this, they should take into account how far the answer meets the requirements of the level:

- If it meets the requirements *fully*, markers should be prepared to award full marks within the level. The top mark in the level is used for answers that are as good as can realistically be expected within that level
- If it only *barely* meets the requirements of the level, markers should consider awarding marks at the bottom of the level. The bottom mark in the level is used for answers that are the weakest that can be expected within that level
- The middle marks of the level are used for answers that have a *reasonable* match to the descriptor. This might represent a balance between some characteristics of the level that are fully met and others that are only barely met.

Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 2

Section A: Question 1(a)

Target: AO2 (10 marks): Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little substantiation. The concept of value may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	4–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material, but mainly to expand or confirm matters of detail.• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and with some substantiation for assertions of value. The concept of value is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	7–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.• Sufficient knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences, as well as to expand or confirm matters of detail.• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and based on valid criteria although justification is not fully substantiated. Explanation of value takes into account relevant considerations such as the nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author.

Section A: Question 1(b)

Target: A02 (15 marks): Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little supporting evidence. The concept of reliability may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis, by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material but mainly to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. The concept of reliability is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	8–11	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.• Detailed knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of weight takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria, with some justification.
4	12–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion.• Deploys well-selected knowledge of the historical context, but mainly to illuminate or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material. Displays some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may not be fully substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.

Section B

Target: AO1 (25 marks): Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
1	1–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	7–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	13–18	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although some mainly descriptive passages may be included.• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.
4	19–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision.

Section A: Indicative content

Option 1C: Russia, 1917-91: From Lenin to Yeltsin

Question	Indicative content
1a	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme.</p> <p>The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are required to analyse the source and consider its value for an enquiry into the reasons for Lenin's dismissal of the Constituent Assembly in January 1918.</p> <p>1. The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It suggests that only a Soviet government can achieve the aims of the Revolution ('Only class institutions (such as the Soviets) were capable of ... laying the foundations of socialist society')• It implies that the Constituent Assembly represents the old, exploitative government of Russia ('a step backwards', 'absolutely incompatible with the aim of achieving socialism')• It provides evidence that the Soviets did not control the newly-elected Constituent Assembly ('The Party of Right Socialist-Revolutionaries obtained the majority in the Constituent Assembly'). <p>2. The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Draft Decree was written by Lenin who was responsible for the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly• Lenin, as a key proponent of Soviet power, was in an excellent position to explain the reasons for the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly that would have replaced the Soviets• The Draft Decree represents the position of the Bolshevik Party on the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly which was issued immediately after the event. <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy /usefulness of information. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lenin had no intention of sharing power with other socialist groups but had allowed elections for a Constituent Assembly to go ahead to prevent a backlash• The Constituent Assembly posed a great threat to Lenin's plans for Soviet government, because it represented a legitimate government which was not controlled by the Bolsheviks• The Socialist Revolutionary party won 410 seats in the Constituent Assembly compared to the 175 won by the Bolsheviks• When Lenin dissolved the Constituent Assembly, he claimed that it was not legitimate because it represented bourgeois democracy whereas Soviet government represented a higher stage of democracy. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
1b	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme.</p> <p>The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are required to analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into the impact of Gorbachev's reduction of traditional controls in the late 1980s.</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The author has no connections to the Soviet government and can take a relatively impartial view of events • The article was published in an American newspaper that is likely to support the loosening of restrictions • The article was published in 1989 which allowed the author to take a view on the impact of the reduction of traditional controls over several years. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides evidence that the reduction of press controls had been popular in the Soviet Union ('has made it the country's best-selling newspaper, with a weekly circulation of 29 million.') • It implies that not all Soviet newspapers have embraced the new openness ('shamed such traditional state-controlled newspapers as Pravda') • It suggests that the Soviet government opposes the direction in which greater openness has led the press ('Starkov was criticised by Gorbachev, for the tone of his newspaper'). <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gorbachev was responsible for introducing the policy of glasnost in 1985-86, which was intended to develop new ideas, revitalise the Communist Party and encourage support from the people • Gorbachev did not support whole-scale freedoms. Glasnost was intended to promote mature discussion, but instead it led to fierce criticisms • Aleksander Yakolev was given responsibility for the media. He gave it considerable freedom; too much in Gorbachev's opinion • The relaxation of censorship allowed previously forbidden works to be published as well as previously forbidden topics to be discussed. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Section B: Indicative content

Option 1C: Russia, 1917-91: From Lenin to Yeltsin

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether, in the years 1928-53, the use of terror was the most significant factor in the control of the population of the Soviet Union.</p> <p>The arguments and evidence that, in the years 1928-53, the use of terror was the most significant factor in the control of the population of the Soviet Union should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The use of terror in the countryside including the requisitioning of grain and the liquidation of the 'kulaks' established control over rural areas• The purges and the show trials of the 1930s enforced Stalin's control over the party. This was reinforced by the 1949 purge of the Leningrad Party• From 1937, the NKVD was set targets for arrests, executions and exiles. It was vigorous in persecuting those identified as enemies. Fear of the NKVD encouraged denunciations from the public, which enforced control• A network of gulags was established where inmates were subject to the harsh conditions and forced labour. More than 2 million died in the camps• In the 1940s, Beria's mass deportations of Kalmyks, Tartars and Chechens helped enforce control over ethnic minorities. <p>The arguments and evidence that, in the years 1928-53, there were other more significant factors in the control of the population of the Soviet Union should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The cult of Stalin created a figure that the people could trust, respect and worship. Control was achieved by inspiring loyalty to the leader. This was reinforced by Stalin's successes in the Second World War• Censorship ensured that unfavourable stories were not printed or broadcast, and that the achievements of the Soviet system were promoted, which encouraged support from the population• Government control of the education system and the development of the Komsomol ensured that young Soviet citizens were thoroughly indoctrinated with, and supported, the ideals of the Soviet system• Control was achieved through the implementation of social benefits which won support from sections of the population, e.g. social security payments for some urban workers; higher education opportunities for women. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p> <p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to</p>

3

the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.

Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the extent to which Khrushchev's economic policies succeeded in improving agriculture in the Soviet Union in the years 1953-64.

The arguments and evidence that Khrushchev's economic policies succeeded in improving agriculture in the Soviet Union in the years 1953-64 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The Virgin Lands scheme was initially successful. The opening up of new agricultural lands contributed to a 50 per cent increase in the production of maize by 1958
- State farms, created by the merger of collective farms, were given the freedom to buy machinery instead of hiring from the MTS. Larger farms made greater investment in agriculture possible
- Greater productivity was encouraged by the increase of prices for the state procurement of agricultural produce and by permitting the sale of produce from private plots. This led to more regular food supplies for the population
- The incomes of peasants working on the State farms rose at a faster rate than any other sector of the population. They received a fixed wage and social benefits that were not available to peasants on collective farms.

The arguments and evidence that Khrushchev's economic policies did not succeed in improving agriculture in the Soviet Union in the years 1953-64 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- After 1958, the Virgin lands scheme failed. The soils were unsuitable and insufficient fertilisers were provided to replenish the soil. The lands suffered from wind and dust erosion. Consequently, production declined
- Private plots were the most productive part of agriculture but Khrushchev refused to really boost their role for fear of undermining collective farming
- Productivity remained low. In 1963, the Soviet Union had to import grain from the capitalist West to compensate for shortages in its production
- The shortages of crop harvests led to insufficient supplies of animal fodder. Millions of animals had to be slaughtered as a consequence. This led to a shortage of meat for the population.

Other relevant material must be credited.

4

Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.

Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether there were significant changes to Soviet higher education in the years 1945-91.

The arguments and evidence that there were significant changes to Soviet higher education in the years 1945-91 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- There was a significant expansion in the number of students participating in higher education over the period, e.g. before 1945 there were fewer than 1 million students; by 1980 this had grown to over 5 million
- Khrushchev abolished fees for students attending university in 1956. This encouraged a change in recruitment with more poorer students applying to university
- The curriculum was changed during the Khrushchev era. New higher education institutions specialised in technical subjects rather than on the academic subjects that had previously dominated Soviet higher education
- Higher education was now provided for the non-Russian minorities. Khrushchev initiated a programme of building institutions and this was continued by Brezhnev who founded 18 universities in non-Russian Soviet republics
- In 1988 Gorbachev introduced reforms to higher education that encouraged greater autonomy for universities and allowed for greater creativity and more flexibility in the curriculum.

The arguments and evidence that there were not significant changes to Soviet higher education in the years 1945-91 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The rate of increase in participation from 1945 was not maintained throughout the period. By 1980 the percentage of secondary-school graduates admitted to universities had dropped to only two-thirds of the 1960 figure
- Grants were too low to cover living costs which meant that the system continued, as before, to favour students from wealthier backgrounds
- The status of the new technical higher education institutions set up under Khrushchev remained lower than those that continued to specialise in traditional academic subjects
- Under Brezhnev, the number of students from poorer backgrounds declined. University again became the preserve of professional families rather than those from worker or peasant backgrounds
- The study of Marxist-Leninist theory continued to dominate the curriculum e.g. all postgraduate humanities students had to include a chapter on the truths of Marxism-Leninism in their thesis.

Other relevant material must be credited.