Pearson Edexcel

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2024

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 and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

January 2024
Question Paper Log Number P75137A
Publications Code WHI02_1C_MS_2401
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- 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.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- 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.

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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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: **AO2 (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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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	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. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates are required to analyse the source and consider its value for an enquiry into the nature of the government established by Lenin. 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: • It claims that the main instrument of government was to be the Soviets ('All power, centrally and locally, is entrusted to these Soviets') • It indicates equality and Marxist ideals were the fundamental principles in the government established by Lenin ('abolish all exploitation', 'eliminate the division of society into classes', 'Private ownership … abolished') • It suggests that the government would be ruthless in establishing its control ('destroy the resistance of the exploiters without mercy') • It suggests that the government was to exert complete control over the lives of the citizens of the state ('laws on workers' control', 'universal conscription of labour'). 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: • The purpose of the *Declaration* was to establish a new constitution for Russia in the aftermath of the Bolshevik Revolution • The *Declaration* was written by Lenin who had a very clear idea as to his intentions to establish the government of Soviet Russia along Marxist lines • The *Declaration* was adopted by the All-Russian Congress of workers' and peasants' deputies indicating that it represented the official position of the newly-established Bolshevik government. 3. Knowledge of the historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include: • Lenin replaced the Constituent Assembly, which rejected the *Declaration*, with the All-Russian Congress of Soviets, the body where the Bolsheviks held the most influence, as an instrument of popular support • Lenin's plans for the government in Russia were dominated by his Marxist beliefs, with its ideology focused on giving power to those claiming to represent the proletariat, and his ideas on centralised control • The key features of the *Declaration* were included in the 1918 Constitution and became the legal basis of the communist government in Russia. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
1b	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. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates are required to analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into the reasons for the attempted coup against President Gorbachev in August 1991. 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: • The Manifesto was issued by the leaders of the attempted coup who were in an excellent position to explain their reasons for acting against Gorbachev • The Manifesto represented the views of the hardliners who were opposed to Gorbachev's reforms. The purpose of the Manifesto was to encourage rejection of Gorbachev and a return to the old Soviet system • The leaders of the coup were seeking the support of the population and would naturally argue that their action was justified. 2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences: • It claims that Gorbachev's reforms had failed and had damaged the Soviet Union ('reforms … are going nowhere', 'catastrophic effect on the economy') • It implies that a coup was necessary to save the country ('grave danger threatens our great homeland!', 'Extreme nationalist groups…aimed at the destruction of the Soviet Union') • It suggests that the draft of the new Union Treaty was a motivation for the attempted coup ('results of the nationwide referendum on the unity of the Soviet Union have been destroyed.') • It provides evidence that the Committee intends to govern Russia ('State Committee for the State of Emergency in the USSR is assuming responsibility for the fate of the homeland'). 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 the content. Relevant points may include: • Gorbachev's political and economic reforms, which introduced elements of democratisation and marketisation, were opposed by hardline communists who wanted a continuation of the orthodox Marxist-Leninist system • Gorbachev's new programme for the Communist Party, drafted in August 1991, removed references to Communism, except as a 'social ideal' • The results of Gorbachev's economic reforms were disappointing. By 1990, factories were bartering for much-needed resources and in the population levels of poverty were rising • Hardliners opposed Gorbachev's Union Treaty that was passed by the Supreme Soviet in April 1991 because power would shift to the Republics and reduce their power bases in the army, party and KGB. Other relevant material must be credited.

Section B: Indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
2	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 the aims of Stalin's Five-Year Plans changed considerably in the years 1928-53. The arguments and evidence that the aims of Stalin's Five-Year Plans changed considerably in the years 1928-53 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The aim of the 1st Five-Year Plan was to develop heavy industry, coal, iron and steel, by the use of target setting. The production aims were constantly revised upwards during its operation • The 1st Five-Year Plan aimed to remove the 'bourgeois' Nepmen and begin the process of building Socialism in One Country. After their removal, this aim was not a feature of subsequent Plans • The aims of the 2nd Five-Year Plan changed to focus on developing light industry and consumer goods to improve living standards. This aim was dropped in the latter years and the 3rd Five-Year Plan focused on war • The aim of the 4th Five-Year Plan changed from the previous plans with its focus on economic reconstruction after the war, e.g. the rebuilding of damaged factories and their reconversion to civilian production • The 4th and 5th Five-Year Plans changed from their predecessors, with their aim to turn the Soviet Union into a military Superpower with a nuclear capability. The arguments and evidence that the aims of Stalin's Five-Year Plans did not change in the years 1928-53 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The key aim to modernise the Soviet economy was a constant feature in the priorities set in the five Plans operating from 1928-53 • There was a continuous aim to improve workers' skills and increase their productivity in all five of the Plans running from 1928-53 • The need to develop the economy to enable Soviet Russia to defend itself from foreign attack was a key aim in all five of the Plans running from 1928-53 and meant that planning always focused on heavy industry • The intention to develop the Soviet as a command economy based on Marxist principles was a key aim in all the plans. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
3	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 attitudes towards the family in Russia under Brezhnev were very similar to attitudes towards the family in Russia under Khrushchev. The arguments and evidence that attitudes to the family in Russia under Brezhnev were very similar to attitudes to the family in Russia under Khrushchev should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Both Khrushchev and Brezhnev held similar attitudes towards the nature of the Soviet family; the ideal family was the traditional nuclear family in which the husband worked, and the wife cared for the children and the home • Both Khrushchev and Brezhnev regarded the primary role of women to be birthing children rather than paid employment • Both Khrushchev and Brezhnev believed it was necessary to introduce policies that alleviated some of the pressures on women in the family, e.g. Khrushchev extended maternity leave from 77 to 112 days and Brezhnev lowered the pension age for women from 60 years to 55 years • Both Khrushchev and Brezhnev accepted that women must perform a 'double shift' and that their leisure time was severely curtailed by family duties compared to the leisure time available to their husbands • Both Khrushchev and Brezhnev were concerned by the high rates of divorce. Under Khrushchev, couples were urged to control their passions for the good of their children. Under Brezhnev, the Family Code of 1968 restricted access to divorce. The arguments and evidence that attitudes towards the family in Russia under Brezhnev were different from attitudes towards the family in Russia under Khrushchev should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Khrushchev recognised the need for women to work outside of the home and attempted to make that possible by expanding childcare and providing communal laundries, whereas Brezhnev declared that sexual equality had been achieved and women preferred homemaking to well-paid jobs • Khrushchev was more liberal in his attitudes and allowed the proliferation of women's magazines that described the hardships of family life, whereas Brezhnev would not permit criticism of his family policy and prevented news of Western campaigns for female liberation spreading • Khrushchev took a more liberal view of sexuality and contraception, whereas Brezhnev held strict views. Under Brezhnev, homosexuality was criminalised, contraception restricted, and incentives were provided to increase the birth rate in the European Soviet states. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
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 the Soviet government failed to suppress the actions of dissidents in the years 1965-82. The arguments and evidence that the Soviet government failed to suppress the actions of dissidents in the years 1965-82 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Dissidents caught the government by surprise by openly demonstrating in Red Square in December 1965. Ginsburg, Sakharov and Bukovsky called on the government to obey the Constitution and grant their civil rights • The Sinyavsky/Daniel affair led to a backlash of dissidence from intellectuals who opposed government restrictions on their right to freedom of expression as laid down in the Constitution • The government was unable to suppress religious dissidence, e.g. in the 1970s, actions taken against Jewish *refusniks* led to an international outcry and forced the Soviet government to authorise Jewish emigration • Historian Roy Medvedev and writer Valentin Rasputin continued to criticise aspects of the Soviet state, despite the actions taken by the state against dissidents. The arguments and evidence that the Soviet government succeeded in suppressing the actions of dissidents in the years 1965-82 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The trial, conviction and imprisonment of Sinyavsky and Daniel in 1966, for publishing material critical of the Soviet Union abroad, sent a clear message that the government would not tolerate dissidents • The Soviet government introduced new laws from September 1966 to suppress the actions of dissidents. In 1967, it established a new section in the KGB to deal with ideological challenges to the regime • The secret police were very effective in conducting surveillance and harassing suspected dissidents. Threats to expel intellectuals from professional organisations or from their posts curbed dissidence • By the early 1980s, the government appeared to have crushed dissidence. The leading dissidents were in prison or exiled and there were few dissident publications in circulation. Other relevant material must be credited.

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom