

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE in History  
(8HI0) Paper 1E

Paper 1: Breadth study with  
interpretations

Option 1E: Russia, 1917-91: from  
Lenin to Yeltsin

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information, please visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com).

Our website subject pages hold useful resources, support material and live feeds from our subject advisors giving you access to a portal of information. If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

[www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus)

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2016

Publications Code 49959

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

## 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.
- For questions targeting AO2, candidates must not be credited for citing information in the preamble.

## 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 uppermiddle 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: sections A and B

**Target:** AO1: 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
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is limited 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 question.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation, and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>11–16</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>17–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.</li> </ul>

## Section C

**Target:** A03: Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate.</li><li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the extracts.</li><li>• Judgement on the view is assertive, with little or no supporting evidence</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate.</li><li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the extracts, but only to expand on matters of detail or to note some aspects which are not included.</li><li>• A judgement on the view is given, but with limited support and related to the extracts overall, rather than specific issues</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>11–16</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts and shows some analysis by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences</li><li>• Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts.</li><li>• A judgement is given and related to some key points of view in the extracts and discussion is attempted, albeit with limited substantiation.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>17–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised by comparison of them.</li><li>• Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge to discuss the views. Most of the relevant aspects of the debate will be discussed, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth.</li><li>• Discusses evidence in order to reach a supported overall judgement. Discussion of points of view in the extracts demonstrates understanding that the issues are matters of interpretation.</li></ul>

## Section A: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
<b>1</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' 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 on whether state propaganda was the main reason for the Soviet regime's control over its people in the years 1917-53.</p> <p>The importance of state propaganda for the Soviet regime's control over its people should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• State propaganda (due to the regime's control of the mass media and its ability to restrict access to foreign sources of information) provided most of the USSR's population with its world view in the years 1917-53.</li><li>• The personality cults built around Lenin and Stalin also functioned as important mechanisms to generate popular acceptance of the regime.</li><li>• Soviet control of the arts and culture (e.g. Prolekult, avant-garde and Socialist Realism) was also deployed to establish popular endorsement of the new socialist society.</li></ul> <p>The importance of other factors for the Soviet regime's control over its people should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Soviet regime's widespread use of violence and intimidation to retain political control (e.g. the Red Terror of 1918 and the purges of the 1930s and early 1950s)</li><li>• The persecution of religious beliefs and practices to remove rival belief systems (e.g. religious repression during the Civil War and the 1930s)</li><li>• The galvanising effect of victory in 1945 on the population and the Russian tradition of obedience to authority.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' 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 Khrushchev's limited reform of the Soviet government was the main reason for the regime's growing political stagnation in the years 1964-82.</p> <p>The role played by Khrushchev's limited reform of the Soviet government in the regime's growing political stagnation in the years 1964-82 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The limitations of Khrushchev's de-Stalinisation programme encouraged political stagnation e.g. political criticism could still result in internal exile or confinement in a psychiatric hospital.</li> <li>• Khrushchev's limited reforms to restrict the tenure of high-ranking positions to three years left many conservatively-inclined senior party figures in post and deeply resentful of his attempts to change the system.</li> <li>• Khrushchev's initiatives to decentralise decision-making did little to shift power away from the conservative forces at the top of the Soviet system and the opposition of this 'anti-reform' faction contributed to his fall in 1964.</li> </ul> <p>The role played by other factors in the regime's growing political stagnation in the years 1964-82 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brezhnev encouraged political stagnation by reversing several of Khrushchev's reforms e.g. limits on the tenure of office.</li> <li>• Under Brezhnev, by the early 1980s the party leadership had developed into a self-serving, ageing and conservatively-minded oligarchy only interested in preserving the status quo.</li> <li>• Brezhnev made no attempt to deal with the Stalinist legacy which also encouraged growing political stagnation</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

## Section B: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
<b>3</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' 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 how far, in the years 1953-85, the priorities for Soviet industry and agriculture changed.</p> <p>The extent to which the priorities for Soviet industry and agriculture changed should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Khrushchev attempted to focus on light industry, chemicals and consumer goods (rather than heavy industry) to broaden the Soviet economy e.g. the Seven Year Plan (1959-65)</li><li>• Khrushchev's greater investment in agriculture, and his Virgin Lands scheme, helped to raise the status of agriculture, increased food production and raised farmers' income.</li><li>• Brezhnev also accepted the need to boost consumer industries (e.g. the ninth Five Year Plan of 1971-75) and make greater investment in agriculture.</li></ul> <p>How far the priorities for Soviet industry and agriculture did not change should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Soviet military-industrial complex, with its enduring attachment to heavy industry, remained a dominant influence in economic policy-making throughout this period.</li><li>• After Khrushchev, the USSR reverted to the methods of the command economy established under Stalin e.g. the Brezhnev regime gave greater economic powers to Gosplan.</li><li>• The Kosygin reforms launched in 1965 to improve production and give incentives for managerial initiative were effectively side-lined by conservative opponents by 1968.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>



Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' 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 on whether the most significant Soviet social development in the years 1917-85 was the improved status of women.</p> <p>In considering the most significant Soviet social development in the years 1917-85, the improved status of women should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Soviet ideology was committed to improving the status of women e.g. decrees on marriage, divorce, abortion and equality (1917-18) and measures to improve female participation in higher education (1930s).</li> <li>• Under Khrushchev and Brezhnev the status of rural women improved as social provision (e.g. healthcare and maternity benefits) were extended to the countryside.</li> <li>• Female role models who excelled in a particular field epitomised this rising status and were endorsed by the regime to encourage other women e.g. Valentina Tereshkova (first woman in space 1963).</li> </ul> <p>In considering the most significant Soviet social development in the years 1917-85, other factors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact of the growth of primary, secondary and higher education in the USSR in the years 1917-85 and the reduction in illiteracy.</li> <li>• The impact of full or almost full employment in the USSR since the 1930s.</li> <li>• The impact of the expanding provision of social security benefits (e.g. pensions), housing and healthcare, particularly from the 1950s.</li> <li>• The limits to women's improving status e.g. underrepresentation at all levels in the Communist Party throughout the period and the persistent expectation that women should combine employment with family responsibilities.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

## Section C: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
5	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' 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.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the view that the Soviet Union collapsed because of Gorbachev's failure to deal with the challenge of nationalism. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument. Candidates should use their discussion of various views to reach a reasoned conclusion.</p> <p>In considering the given view, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <p>Extract 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Gorbachev's pursuit of <i>glasnost</i> and his reluctance to use force made the break-up of the Soviet Union possible</li><li>• As a multinational empire, the USSR could only function as a single entity if the central government firmly held national feeling in check – this did not happen under Gorbachev.</li><li>• Rising nationalism within the USSR undermined <i>perestroika</i>, took Gorbachev by surprise and generated a powerful momentum for independence from Soviet control.</li></ul> <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Gorbachev did not allow sufficient time for economic reform to bring positive results and attempted unsuccessfully to force the pace of change with radical measures.</li><li>• Lacking knowledge of economics, Gorbachev was influenced by economists who promised him success and those with more radical proposals.</li><li>• Economists could not predict accurately the outcome of their reforms because they lacked practical experience of the market economy and industry and also wrongly assumed that the planned economy had great flexibility.</li></ul> <p>Candidates should use their own knowledge of the issues to address the view that the collapse of the Soviet Union happened because of Gorbachev's failure to deal with the challenge of nationalism. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Gorbachev's foreign policy towards the Eastern bloc (which promoted 'people power' and self-determination) and his insensitive treatment of national minorities within the USSR helped to fragment the Soviet Union.</li><li>• The growth, and damaging impact, of nationalist sentiment in key parts of the USSR e.g. the Baltic republics</li><li>• The nationalist demands of the non-Russian republics were encouraged by Yeltsin.</li></ul> <p>Candidates should use their own knowledge of the issues related to the debate to address other conditional and/or contingent reasons which explain the collapse of</p>

the Soviet Union. Relevant points may include:

- Gorbachev's initial reliance on the flawed 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan to promote economic growth served only to underline the serious weaknesses of the Soviet system e.g. out of date technology, quantity not quality.
- Economic *perestroika* and the introduction of market mechanisms (1987) undermined the unity of the USSR by failing to produce adequate supplies of food and consumer goods for the Soviet population.
- Major divisions over the 500 Days Programme (1989), designed to move rapidly to a market-led economy, resulted in an economic collapse which further weakened the Soviet system.
- The impact of *glasnost* and the failure to reform the Communist Party e.g. the repeal of Article 6 (1990).

Other relevant material must be credited.