



Examiners' Report

June 2022

GCSE History 1HIA 30

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at 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.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2022

Publications Code 1HIA_30_2206_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

Introduction

It was pleasing to see that students seemed confident in tackling this paper after a three-year gap in formal examinations. They coped well with the range of question styles, which covered all four Assessment Objectives, and they responded particularly well to the enquiry 'package' in question 3.

The answer space provided is intended to be sufficient for the question to be answered in full and although some students did write on extra sheets they were not always as successful as those who produced more concise answers. Where additional space is needed, it is important that students clearly state that the answer is continued on paper.

Questions on this paper cover all the Assessment Objectives but over half of the available marks are for question 3, which focuses on sources and interpretations. These questions form a coherent package leading to a final question in which students, having explored the utility of the provided sources, analysed the different views presented in the interpretations and the reasons for those differences, and are then invited to judge the extent to which they agree with one of the interpretations. It is therefore important that students appreciate the difference between sources and interpretations, and the focus of different parts of question 3.

The focus in 3(c) is on why the interpretations might differ and the specific areas of weakness explained below should be read carefully. It is not possible to provide effectively substantiated reasons why the interpretations are different based on such things as where and when the interpretations were published although a small number of students did attempt to do so without success – (see specific information about 3(c) below).

Question 3(d) carries the highest number of marks on the paper. Successful students will have already seen how the views in the interpretations are different, why this might be the case and, in completing 3(a) have understood that there is likely to be evidence in support of both interpretations. They are now asked how far they agree with one of the interpretations. The strongest answers to 3(d), therefore, focused clearly on the interpretations themselves, reviewing the alternative views and coming to a substantiated judgement. Students who focused exclusively on the view provided in Interpretation 2 and used this as a basis for an essay based on their own knowledge were less successful than those who considered the alternative views from both interpretations. There is no expectation that both interpretations are dealt with in equal depth but both should be examined explicitly. The use of contextual knowledge is an important element in this evaluation but it must be precisely selected to support the evaluation and not just used to display knowledge of aspects of the topic which the student has revised but are not relevant to the enquiry. In addition, some of the strongest answers were able to show how the differences of view in the two interpretations were conveyed in reaching their overall judgements.

Examiners reported some impressive answers to 3(d) and many students were able to engage confidently with the interpretations, taking a range of approaches. However, this question was accessible to all students and even those who did not score highly understood the need to offer evaluative responses leading to an overall conclusion. Only a few students were unable to identify the view being offered by the interpretations, so the majority were able to construct a response in relation to these views. Students rarely seemed rushed and full answers were generally provided showing that timing wasn't generally an issue on this paper.

Question 1

This question requires students to make two inferences from a source and it is often regarded as an 'easy' question. However, students need to be sure that the inferences they make are valid inferences and not just paraphrases of the content of the source.

The focus of the question was about the impact of Bolshevik policies on women. There were two marks available for each valid inference – one for the inference itself and one for the supporting information. Most students seemed to understand how to make an inference, and most used the content of the source to provide support for the inference. Such students tended to make inferences about the increased political opportunities women had, which could be referenced by the ability of women to 'take part in the discussions and decisions of their local soviets'. However, a significant minority of inferences focused on the position of women before the revolution which was not the focus of the question. A small number of students occasionally made comments on Bukharin without it being an inference about women. A small number of students wrote a lot about *why* their supporting information helped to support the inference, which is not required and did not gain any extra marks but possibly wasted time.

Complete the table below to explain your answer.

(i) What I can infer:

Women were given more political powers due to Bolshevik policies

Details in the source that tell me this:

'express their opinions about... important issues in Russia'

'take part... decisions... local soviets'

(ii) What I can infer:

Women were given more freedom due to Bolshevik policies

Details in the source that tell me this:

'do not hesitate to make a long journey to Moscow' 'transformation'

'talents... of women have grown'



This student has made two inferences about the impact of Bolshevik policies on women supported by direct reference to the source, so gains full marks.



Think about the space provided – inferences do not need to be explained in great detail and a single sentence is enough.

(i) What I can infer:

The Bolshevik policies gave women a voice and the right to speak out

Details in the source that tell me this:

"now they are able to take part in the discussions and decisions of their local soviets"

(ii) What I can infer:

Before the revolution, women weren't allowed to do many things

Details in the source that tell me this:

"Before the revolution, these women lived and worked in their villages"



The first inference is valid and is supported by appropriate evidence. However, the second inference is not valid as it does not refer to the impact of Bolshevik policies.



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

Question 2

In question 2, the focus will always be on causation but the question does not require a judgement to be made or for the answer to prioritise or show interaction of factors and no marks were available to reward this evaluation, however strongly argued. Instead, the most successful students showed a consistent analytical focus throughout their answers and many were able to access Level 4 by doing so.

In question 2, the stimulus points in the question will often be useful reminders to students of specific areas of content which they can write about. Students do not need to use these stimulus points but there is an expectation that there will be some depth of knowledge, shown by three discrete aspects of content being covered, although this does not mean students need to identify three different causes or events.

A number of answers remained at Level 3, despite excellent knowledge, because they missed the focus of the question. The mark scheme's bullet point for Assessment Objective 2 (analysis) at Level 4 expects an analytical explanation, directed consistently at the conceptual focus of the question. Students who responded to the topic rather than the key idea were unlikely to achieve high marks. Those who did reach Level 4 realised that the topic provides the context but that there is a specific focus, which the analysis should address.

Many students performed well on this question and the majority of students were able to go beyond the stimulus points, with reference to three aspects of content, and relate these to the question. It was noteworthy that even students with more limited knowledge of the content were often able to provide a clear structure in their answers, if not a clear analytical focus. The stimulus points are provided to help students to link the question they have been asked with the material they have studied and to provide a prompt to the analysis of the process of change.

The majority of students were confident in discussing the need to provide food for industrial workers as a reason for changes in agriculture and many recognised the important role ideology played in Stalin's drive to rid the USSR of the kulaks and create a society based on communist principles. Many students were also able to discuss the fear Stalin had about ensuring there was a well-fed army to protect the USSR from attacks coming from the west. Many students also had a good understanding about how collectivisation would help Stalin achieve control over vast parts of the population.

Some knowledgeable students failed to score highly because they did not properly address the focus of the question. This was not a question about how Stalin changed agriculture, but was about the reasons for these changes. Some answers focused on a description of the changes and were therefore unlikely to achieve high marks in Assessment Objective 2, as they were not addressing the conceptual focus of the question – causation. Some students discussed industrialisation but did not link the five-year plans to agriculture or give details of the impact agriculture would have on industry, for example – feeding the workers or having peasants move from the countryside into the towns. Some did, however, link industrial output to creating tractors for the collective farms.

At Level 2, students often described the changes in agriculture which left links to the question implicit, which fits Level 2 for the AO2 focus on analysis. At Level 3, students were mainly focused on the conceptual focus of the question but sometimes lacked the wide-ranging knowledge required at Level 4. At Level 4, there were many sustained analytical responses supported by well-chosen examples which displayed clear understanding of the precise question and these were often rewarded with full marks.

2 Explain why Stalin introduced changes to agriculture.

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- kulaks
- Five-Year Plans

You **must** also use information of your own.

- problems w NEP (12)
- industrialisation
- ~~economy~~ (MFS)
- fear of invasion (need to feed)
- get rid of Bukharin

One reason why Stalin introduced changes to agriculture was due to economic problems. Due to the NEP there were peasants who were able to get profit out of it (kulaks), however this went against communist principles that the Communist Party held. This meant that to take away the power that the kulaks had, Stalin needed to enforce collectivisation. This would mean that all the profit kulaks gained they could make no more of as they had to pool their land in into collective farms such as the kolkhoz. In collective farms everyone would earn the same amount when they provided the food grain that the state needed. Stalin introduced changes in agriculture as he felt that the kulaks were gaining too much power and wanted to be able to control them. Furthermore, he ~~was~~ could gain control over the whole countryside due to the Machine tractor stations which each had secret police. This meant that Stalin could make sure no peasants were disobeying him and he could stay in power.

Another reason for changes in agriculture was due to

the industrialisation that Stalin wanted to be in Soviet Union. Industrialisation was very expensive and they needed to be able to fund this. Stalin believed the only way he could do this was by selling produce abroad to other countries to gain profit. However, the Soviet Union was currently not producing enough produce due to problems with farming techniques. Before collectivisation they used scattered strip farming methods to farm, this only created a low amount of produce though so Stalin needed this to change. With Collective farms they were able to use tractors to increase the speed of farming which led to more produce being created. This meant Stalin was able to raise enough money for the five year plans. There were also problems with the NEP which led to changes in agriculture as Stalin did not approve of it.

A final reason that Stalin introduced change in agriculture was due to fear. One of his fears was the fear of invasion, Stalin believed that they would soon be attacked by the west. This meant that there needed to be enough food to supply the army, currently there was not enough, and they also needed a decent amount of supplies in order to win. Stalin remembered

now the Russia had to back out of the WWI and have massive implications due to them not being strong enough. If changes in agriculture was made then the army could be stored and they could win and also deter any enemies. More food led to more rapid industrialisation which meant that they could have better supplies. Another fear that Stalin had was people trying to overthrow him. Stalin needed to get rid of Bukharin and one way to do that was collectivisation. This could occur as Bukharin and his supporters wanted to continue with the NEP and if he introduced collectivisation he could get rid of them by discrediting them and saying they don't support communist values. Stalin changed agriculture due to his paranoia about invasion and his leadership.

* This was due to the civil war which showed to Stalin that the British and the French were willing to help the whites in order to stop the takeover of Communism and prevent it from spreading to other countries.



The student has covered three areas of content (the kulaks, the Five-Year Plans and the Red Army) and has, therefore, satisfied the requirements for higher marks in Assessment Objective 1 to go beyond the stimulus points and to show wide-ranging knowledge. The quality of analysis also meets the demands of the mark scheme for Assessment Objective 2. Although this student has not provided a conclusion, Level 4 has been reached by the focus on the question which is evident in every paragraph.



Keep the analysis linked to the question all the way through the answer and make sure that detail is being used to support the analysis, rather than being provided simply as information.

The answer provides an explanation covering 2 aspects of content (kulaks and the Five-Year Plans) which is mainly directed at the conceptual focus of the question. However, the third aspect of content (tractor production) was not made relevant to the conceptual focus of the question. Therefore, Level 3 was achieved.

2 Explain why Stalin introduced changes to agriculture.

(12)

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- kulaks — equality in farming
- Five-Year Plans → Collectivisation

You **must** also use information of your own.

• Tractor production.

↓
Set example for the western world.

One reason Stalin introduced changes to agriculture was due to his undying hate for the kulaks. He says "they should be liquidated as a class!" and as a result over 100,000 kulaks were killed. This introduces change to agriculture as it implements equality within farms as kulaks were known to be "Rich peasants." Stalin may have done this to fulfill his complete communist ambitions in making everybody equal to one another. Thus, Stalin's infamous massacre of the kulaks was done to introduce equality in agriculture.

Another reason Stalin introduced changes to agriculture was due to the five-year plans. In the first five years, Stalin had big ambitions to introduce the idea of collectivisation within farms. This saw the number of farms in Russia fall greatly from 20,000,000 farms to 200,000. Stalin may have done this to again fulfill his dreams of a completely communist soviet union.

In summary, Stalin introduced collectivisation in the first five-year plan to increase communism in Russian agriculture.

A third reason Stalin introduced changes to agriculture was to set example for the western world. This was done in the relentless rates of tractor production. ~~From~~ The speed of production was powerful as it showed socialist countries in the west that communism was working in attempt to change political views elsewhere. Therefore Stalin used tractor production to show the western world that communism was working.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Organising the answer into paragraphs makes it clear to the examiner that three aspects of content have been covered. A sentence at the end of each section showing how it helps to answer the question can help to raise the AO2 level in an answer.

Question 3 (a)

All of the sub-questions in Section B relate to either the two interpretations, Sources B and C, or both the sources and interpretations. Question 3(a) targets the ability to analyse and evaluate source utility and, in doing so, introduces the enquiry which will be dealt with in further detail in questions 3(b), 3(c) and 3(d).

In question 3(a) students are expected to evaluate the usefulness of the content, taking account of the provenance of the sources and applying contextual knowledge in making judgements about the utility of the sources as evidence for the specific enquiry, in this case the reasons why Stalin won the struggle for power against his rivals. These strands are linked and should be dealt with together, rather than in isolation. There is no need to compare the two sources and, indeed, only a handful of students did attempt to do this.

Students found the sources accessible and were confident in showing that the content of the sources was relevant for the enquiry and therefore useful. They could also make a number of points about the significance of the provenance for the usefulness of the content, although sometimes this consisted of simple statements rather than a developed explanation. When considering provenance, generic comments about a source being biased (with no explanation of how that bias could be detected or why it occurred) or about the source being reliable because it came from the time under investigation, could be made without any reference to the individual source and therefore remained at Level 1. This type of generic assumption was seen when some answers assumed that the authors of the sources would be biased or that the accuracy of Source C would be affected by the passage of time.

At Level 2, developed comments were made about the content of the sources, for example, the fact that in Source B, Stalin is showing his respect for Lenin, and thus his suitability to be leader, or the comments in Source C about Trotsky lacking the affection of some in the Party, which limited his chance to be chosen as leader. There were also good comments made about the provenance of the sources – that Serge was a personal friend of Trotsky's, who was providing insight into how others felt about Trotsky. However, only a small number of students effectively utilised the provenance to establish that the content of the source could be useful, precisely because it was a critical comment from a sympathetic friend.

Some very good answers could not access the higher marks because they did not include contextual knowledge. Contextual knowledge is mentioned at every level of the mark scheme and failure to include it limited a number of otherwise good answers. Students should recognise that it is not enough to repeat a detail from the source and assert that this can be confirmed from the student's own knowledge or to give generalised comments such as 'I know that Trotsky was unpopular' – some additional detail is needed as a demonstration of that own knowledge. Contextual knowledge should be relevant to the enquiry and used to assess the source, for example, to add detail about something mentioned in the source, to add weight to an aspect of the provenance, to place the source in a broader context, or to assess whether the source gave an accurate view or showed a typical situation.

At Level 3, comments need to consider the effect of an aspect of the provenance on the usefulness of the source content, and contextual knowledge should be integrated into the process of reaching a judgement, not simply provided as information.

In this question, the focus should be on assessing the usefulness of what is in the source rather than listing details which are not mentioned. Since the question asks students to evaluate the usefulness of a source, it can be valid to note the limitations of a source but these points need to be used in an overall evaluation of the usefulness of the source; an answer which focuses on 'missing' information without weighing the positive aspects of the source, is unlikely to score highly. Sources should not be dismissed because they do not cover every detail that might be helpful in an investigation and students should recognise that unreliable sources can be very useful. If the answer identifies omissions from the source as limitations on its usefulness, this should be linked to a consideration of the provenance, showing whether this is the result of lack of knowledge or deliberate omission.

The question asks 'how useful' the sources are, so a judgement should be made on the usefulness of the source's evidence for the specific enquiry. Good answers made clear the criteria being used to assess the usefulness for the enquiry of the sources, weighing the value of the content in the light of the provenance and the student's own knowledge. Various criteria could be used, for example accuracy of detail, reliability, the relevance of the source, the way it could be used by the historian, how representative the source is etc. and good students recognised that a source which is regarded as unreliable can be extremely useful to the historian.

Although a judgement should be reached on the overall usefulness of each source, there is no requirement to compare the sources or to use them in combination and no marks are available for this. Students who focused on comparisons between the sources often failed to develop their judgement on each source properly; if this approach is used, it is important that the answer still comes to a judgement on each individual source.

Very few answers only considered one source but it should be noted that every level of the mark scheme refers to 'sources' and therefore answers which do not consider both sources cannot access high marks.

3 (a) Study Sources B and C.

How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into the reasons why Stalin won the struggle for power against his rivals?

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

(8)

Source B is a speech by Stalin, and it shows us that Stalin was a great supporter of Lenin. "We promise you that we shall do this." This shows that Stalin wanted to carry on Lenin's work, which many people would have liked. This matches with my own knowledge because Stalin tried to appear as someone who was very close to Lenin. He even edited photos to show that he was close to Lenin, so that he ~~se~~ seemed the obvious candidate to replace Lenin. Also, he says, "We shall risk our lives to strengthen the union." This shows that he was motivational. This matches with my knowledge because Stalin was a good speaker and was cunning and persuasive, which helped him take power. Source B is a speech by Stalin, showing his exact words. Therefore, this makes it more useful as it clearly demonstrates how confident and ~~person~~ persuasive he is. Also, it was spoken to people who ~~had~~ had an important role in the government, so it shows that it was a genuine,

serious attempt to persuade them. Overall, I think Source B is very useful, as it clearly shows that Stalin was clever and persuasive.

Source C is from a book of memoirs written by someone close to Trotsky, making it already useful. He goes on to say that the people "had no real love for him," and people were "critical of him and his ways of behaving." This matches with my own knowledge as Trotsky was often arrogant, which would have made him unpopular with people. Also, it says, "Trotsky's ideas about solving the problems of Russia made him seem like a dictator." This matches with my own knowledge because Trotsky wanted a 'world revolution' which was unpopular with many people. Source C is written by someone who was close to Trotsky, so he would have good knowledge about him, making it more useful. However, it was written 20 years later than when he is describing Trotsky, so he may have forgotten details. ^{However} I think Source C is very useful still, as he outlines Trotsky's weakness despite being his friend, which suggests that he isn't trying to lie.



This makes developed points about how the provenance might have an impact on the utility of the content of the sources. For example, the student recognises that although Serge is a friend of Trotsky, he makes critical comments about him. The student also applies their own knowledge to test the accuracy of elements of the content of the sources. This answer achieved a Level 3 mark.



Comments about the usefulness of a source should take into account how the provenance affects the usefulness of the source content.

3 (a) Study Sources B and C.

How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into the reasons why Stalin won the struggle for power against his rivals?

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

(8)

Source B is useful because it shows Stalin's speech at congress of Soviet. This is useful as we infer that Stalin made great efforts to link himself with Lenin. From my own knowledge Stalin was having a power struggle with Trotsky so Stalin used trickery and gave Trotsky the wrong date so it appeared like Trotsky didn't care. ~~rather~~ Stalin took advantage and furthermore tried praising Stalin so the Communist Party liked him and gave him support. Source B was written by Stalin. This is very useful as it gives a first hand account of the power struggle. Overall source B is useful into the enquiry of Stalin and struggle for power. It being a first hand account makes it reliable.

Source C informs us about Trotsky and his situation at the party. This is useful because we learn why Trotsky didn't win and what set him apart from Stalin. From my own knowledge Trotsky was a key part of Russian history and Lenin will even speak fondly of Trotsky because he helped in the October Revolution. This source is written by his friend Victor Serge 20 years after he got kicked out of the party. This is less useful ~~and~~ because Serge only has general ideas and doesn't go into detail. Overall this source is useful but not as much as Source B.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

At Level 2 students will make developed comments related to the content of the sources and/or their provenance. In this case, the student makes valid comments testing the content of the source against their own knowledge to assess its accuracy. The mark is limited to Level 2 as the student does not develop the statements made about the provenance of the sources.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Students using precise knowledge to support points about the specific aspects of the source will always perform better than those who just use this question to write about the topic.

Question 3 (b)

In this question, students are asked to identify a difference in the overall view being offered in the interpretations; these do not necessarily contradict each other but they do provide alternative views. The answers should identify the key difference but also provide support from each interpretation to demonstrate that difference. Many answers recognised that the two interpretations offered different views about the reasons for Stalin winning the power struggle against his rivals and could select detail from the two interpretations to support the explanation of that difference.

It is important for students to remember that the focus of this question is to identify the differences between the views rather than identifying differences of surface detail as the latter can only be awarded marks in Level 1. Responses which asserted differences without support, for example stating that Interpretation 1 emphasises the weaknesses of Trotsky, whereas Interpretation 2 emphasises the strengths of Stalin, stayed in Level 1.

Level 2 was achieved when the students indicated a clear difference of view and supported it with detail from the extracts. Most students were able to score full marks.

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

They give different views about the reasons why Stalin won the struggle for power against his rivals.

What is the main difference between these views?

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

(4)

Interpretation 1 gives the view that the weaknesses of Trotsky was the reason why Stalin won the struggle for power. 'Many old Bolsheviks saw Trotsky as an outsider.' It emphasises that Trotsky was arrogant and came across as disloyal. However, Interpretation 2 gives the view that the strengths of Stalin was the reason why he won the struggle for power. 'Stalin was a clever politician who planned his attempt to gain power carefully.' It emphasises that he used Lenin to gain popularity and he was ruthless.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer clearly states the main difference of view between the interpretations and supports this with extracts from the interpretations and as a result gets full marks.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

It is not necessary to write a lengthy answer to achieve full marks.

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

They give different views about the reasons why Stalin won the struggle for power against his rivals.

What is the main difference between these views?

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

(4)

One of the main differences is that Trotsky was arrogant and "treated his colleagues with lack of respect" Plus many Bolsheviks saw Trotsky as an outsider However. With Stalin he took on jobs in the communist party (General secretary) to look good so everyone knows he's gonna be good with the power. It seems that Stalin was clever because he came up with plans but Trotsky he had people doubting him for his loyalty as he only joined the party in 1917. ~~He was~~



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This student selects details from both interpretations to illustrate an implicit difference. The difference is not clearly stated, therefore the answer stays in Level 1.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Students must identify the difference between the interpretations in respect to the given enquiry.

Question 3 (c)

It is important that students recognise the relationship between questions 3(b) and 3(c). Having identified that the two interpretations offer different views, students are asked to suggest a reason why these different views have been reached. They should be able to support their answer with reference to the interpretations. Examiners see each answer separately and therefore cannot be expected to know what has been said in a previous answer. For this reason, students should be explicit in their references to the interpretations. They should also make sure that their answer to 3(c) does not simply repeat their answer to 3(b).

The focus here is on the process by which the historian produces their interpretation. Where answers suggested that when carrying out research, the authors had placed weight on different sources, students could easily score the full 4 marks by linking details in the interpretations with details in Sources B and C. However, this should be explained with references to both the interpretations and the sources rather than simply stating that 'the author of Interpretation 1 might have used Source C'.

Alternative explanations also recognise that the historian's emphasis may affect their research and conclusions. For example, whether an historian deals only with Trotsky or only with Stalin.

Here again, the explanation needs to be supported by the use of the interpretations. In trying to give an explanation for a reason for the difference between interpretations some students are still attempting to use the provenance of the interpretations to provide this explanation and this is unlikely to provide a valid basis for a response to this question. The full reasons for this are explained in the *Getting Started Guide* on pp 43-44. There is also some additional guidance in the 2019 Examiners' Report on p.25. As stated in *Getting Started*: 'Students should distinguish between their comments on contemporary sources and on these texts. Responses based on matters such as the origin or time of production of these secondary works are unlikely to be valid for this question.' However, it is very pleasing to note that many fewer students than in previous years tried to provide explanations for difference on the basis of such factors as the titles of the books, their origin or date of production. There were still a small number of students who gained no marks on this question as they merely repeated what had been said in question 3(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)

Interpretations 1 and 2 may give different views as they may have used different sources to come to an interpretation. Interpretation 1 focuses on the weaknesses of Trotsky in Stalin's rise to power. They may have used sources like Source C which talks about Trotsky's negative traits, "he did not like listening to others". This emphasizes that Trotsky was arrogant, which was unpopular among supporters.

Interpretation 2 focuses on the strengths of Stalin. They may have used sources like Source B which mentions Stalin being close to Lenin, "nothing greater than being a member of the communist Party whose founder and leader was Comrade Lenin". This suggests that Stalin was close to Lenin and supported his ideas. This was popular amongst the Bolsheviks.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This student has gained full marks by explaining how the writers may have different views as they have given weight to different pieces of evidence. They evidence that by referring to the interpretations and the sources and therefore achieve a mark in Level 2.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

To access Level 2, students must be able to evidence the reason they give for the difference in view.

(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)

Interpretation 1 gives similar views to Source C because they both highlight Trotsky's weaknesses for example 'Trotsky was arrogant' and 'He did not like listening to others' which is different to how interpretation 2 and Source B share their view that it was actually Lenin's falsifying of his bond with Lenin that got him support from others as it says 'comrade Lenin' and 'He made great efforts to link himself with Lenin'.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This student has used the sources to support the differences in view but is not explicit about how the sources may have been used to inform the interpretations. This answer remains in Level 1 as the reason for the difference is implicit.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Students can answer this question effectively by evidencing other reasons for the difference in view such as the historians having a different focus or a different emphasis.

Question 3 (d)

Question 3(d) carries the highest number of marks on the paper. Successful students will have already seen how the views in the interpretations are different, why this might be the case and, in completing 3(a) have understood that there is likely to be evidence in support of both interpretations. They are now asked how far they agree with one of the interpretations. The strongest answers to 3(d), therefore, focused clearly on the interpretations themselves, reviewing the alternative views and coming to a substantiated judgement. Students need to recognise that they are not being asked to treat the interpretation as a source and evaluate its reliability or usefulness but to explain whether they think the historian has offered a valid view.

However, a small number of answers attempted to discuss how Stalin won the struggle for power with very little reference to the interpretations. This approach misses the focus of the question, which is about making a judgement on the view offered in Interpretation 2. There is no expectation that both interpretations are dealt with in equal depth but both should be examined explicitly. The use of contextual knowledge is an important element in this evaluation but it must be precisely selected to support the evaluation of the interpretation.

Examiners reported some impressive answers to 3(d) and many students were able to engage confidently with the interpretations, taking a range of approaches. In addition, some of the strongest answers were able to show how the differences of view in the two interpretations were conveyed, for example through the use of language, tone, selection or omission of detail, emphasis created by the structure of the interpretation, etc.

It is expected that students will reach a judgement when answering this question and the strongest students developed their evaluation throughout the answer, creating a consistently argued response. Less successful answers offered points to support the views expressed in Interpretation 2, then used Interpretation 1 to challenge those views, before reaching the view that Interpretation 2 was 'somewhat accurate' or saying that they 'partially agreed with the view in Interpretation 2. In these answers, there was little sense of evaluation, simply an explanation of the different views, with the acknowledgement that each had some valid points. The strongest answers to question 3(d), therefore, focused clearly on the interpretations themselves, integrating evaluation while reviewing the alternative views and coming to a substantiated judgement.

The selection of contextual knowledge to support the evaluation was often a strong aspect of students' responses with most students showing a good awareness of how to deploy their knowledge as well as being in possession of an appropriate level of detail. It was pleasing to note that there were very few responses which focused primarily on providing contextual knowledge for its own sake and that students showed an awareness of how to use their knowledge to help them decide on the validity of views selected from the interpretations. A small number of students were unable to apply their own knowledge effectively. Merely asserting agreement with points in the interpretation by saying 'from my own knowledge I know this to be true' is not sufficient evidence of contextual knowledge.

Yet a full range of responses suggest this question was accessible to students of all ability and full answers were generally provided showing that timing wasn't generally an issue on this paper. Students who focused exclusively on the view provided in Interpretation 2 and used this as a basis for an essay based on their own knowledge were less successful.

The existence of the strands which make up AO4 leads to 'best-fit marking'. All strands are considered before a final mark is decided upon. The most successful students, therefore were able to display evidence of a clear understanding of all 3:

- the quality of the judgement based on reasoning
- the analysis of the provided material
- the deployment of knowledge of the historical context to support the application of criteria.

In addition, most students were able to provide full and structured responses with very few appearing to be rushed or running out of time.

(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 two gives a positive view of Stalin, stating that he was a 'clever politician' who often linked himself with Lenin. Lenin was seen as a God (the cult of Lenin) so Stalin photoshopped himself into many photos with him to make it seem like they were good friends. This gained the support of the public as they felt that Stalin would carry out Lenin's wishes. Stalin also lied to Trotsky about when Lenin's funeral was so ~~the~~ ~~public would~~ Trotsky would lose support, making Stalin seem much better. Stalin's job of 'General Secretary' ~~he~~ gave him lots of power and ~~was~~ information, although it seemed like a boring job. This allowed Stalin to undermine his opponents as they all underestimated his abilities and thought he was boring. Walsh ~~is~~ emphasises how smart Stalin was using ~~adjectives~~ words like 'extremely'. Stalin was also seen as ~~as~~ who 'understood the feelings of people' which made him seem patriotic and a talented

leader. Therefore, Stalin gained lots of support and gained lots of power.

However, interpretation 2 does not mention the fact the Lenin did not want Stalin as a leader which he left as one of his dying wishes. Stalin used his job as General Secretary and used his cunning skills to abolish this & as Lenin saw him for who he truly was. It would've meant that Stalin would have lost all support as the Russians worshipped Lenin and his opinions. Stalin was therefore able to brush it under the rug and gain respect of the public, which helped him secure power.

Interpretation 1 gives the view that Stalin won the struggle for power due to the weaknesses of Trotsky as he was seen as 'arrogant' and people 'doubted his loyalty to the revolution of communism'. Stalin promoted 'socialism in one world', meaning that he wanted to secure the ideas of communism in Russia before spreading it ~~around~~ world wide. This made him seem patriotic and a man that truly cares about the people. However,

Trotsky wanted to promote the revolution world wide straight away making him seem un patriotic, and people questioned his loyalty to Russia. This lost Trotsky support which then allowed Stalin to gain more as he promoted the opposite of Trotsky. This therefore allowed Stalin to win the struggle for power.

However, interpretation ~~of~~ 1 only gives news on Trotsky's weaknesses as a result of Stalin's victory. Stalin manipulated many other politicians ~~with~~ like Bukharin, Zinoviev, Kamenev by forming alliances with them. These alliances allowed Stalin to gain support of other political ~~party~~ parties and widening his support from Russia. Stalin eventually accused these alliances ~~of~~ for things like being a German spy which lost them support and made Stalin ~~stronger~~ stronger. This allowed Stalin to prove that everyone was out to get him, which gained him more support and helped him to win the leadership contest.

Overall, ~~there~~ I strongly agree with ~~the~~ interpretation 2 about how Stalin gained power. However, although Stalin's strengths were big factors, I also thought that weaknesses of Trotsky played a large part ~~of~~ of it to. Trotsky had lots of power he could've used to win, including his control of the military, but he ended up playing his cards wrong and not using it, allowing him to easily be taken down. This therefore, allowed Stalin to gain power through both his strengths and the failures of Trotsky.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This student reviews the alternative views presented in the interpretations and comes to a substantiated conclusion. Some contextual knowledge is used to support the analysis and there is a clear line of reasoning throughout. Level 4 has been met for the judgement and analysis strands, and for the contextual knowledge element. The student is also able to discuss how the differences of view have been conveyed. They therefore achieved a mark at the top of Level 4.



Students who examine precise details from the interpretations and then use their own knowledge to support these points are more likely to gain the higher levels.

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

INFO
DURING
AGG

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

(16)

Interpretation 2 gives the view that Stalin was very clever and cunning; 'Stalin was extremely clever in using his power within the Communist party'. The writer of the interpretation seems to be fond of Stalin and admires his traits and decisions.

'The man who understood the feelings of people who were tired'

Interpretation 2 matches up with my knowledge in some aspects, such as the idea Stalin would 'link himself to Lenin'. We know this is true from events that took place like sharing photographs of them together after his death. He was a 'clever politician' who 'planned his attempt to gain power carefully'. He was a cunning man and managed to turn people against each other.

However interpretation one puts forward the view of Trotsky and how people viewed him as an 'outsider' it gives the impression that a main reason for Stalin winning the struggle for power against his rivals was the weaknesses of Trotsky. The quote 'They doubted his loyalty' and that he suffered with 'ill health' which 'made it hard for him' this implies he was weak not a strong leader like Stalin which Int 2 suggests.* However you could argue that interpretation 2 in the last paragraph it states 'he appeared to be a straightforward man' isn't totally true. This is down to the fact he twisted a lot of people's views on others to get back at other people. For example going against Trotsky and telling the people what they want to hear in order to gain popularity. Although it does state;

'to the People' about him being a 'straight forward man, so this could be true because of the impression he gave to them. Even if underneath he had other plans than what he led on. For example he could be seen as untrustworthy for giving Trotsky the wrong date of the funeral of his ~~the~~ partner.

Overall I fairly agree with Int 2 and believe that Stalin was a clever politician and 'ruthless in picking of his rivals' this matches with my own knowledge of the events. Therefore I agree more with Int 2.

* Interpretation one ~~has~~^{gives} a critical tone within the text about Trotsky and the writer doesn't seem to like his ideas or decisions. The quote;

'He preferred to show his abilities in debates' suggests this.



This student analyses the interpretations well indicating a difference of view: Level 3 for this strand. In terms of contextual knowledge, there is some included and linked to the evaluation though this is not a strength of the answer and thus this strand is in Level 2. There is valid evaluative comment agreeing and countering the interpretation but the insecurity of the judgement limits this strand to Level 2.



Successful students do not just repeat the content of the 2 interpretations. They evaluate the points made in Interpretation 2 using their contextual knowledge and the content of Interpretation 1.

Paper Summary

Examiners commented that there were a number of impressive answers where students seemed well-prepared and demonstrated excellent knowledge being deployed to support thoughtful analysis and evaluation.

The following points should be noted:

- Students need to come up with an inference rather than paraphrasing the source in question 1.
- Students need to recognise the specific focus of the question so that the information being offered is shaped to meet the demands of the question rather than simply describing a situation or including irrelevant material.
- Students should appreciate the difference between sources and interpretations and be aware that interpretations are constructed by historians in order to offer their view of events.
- In all parts of question 3, it is helpful to be explicit about the source or interpretation being discussed.

Spelling, punctuation and grammar were broadly accurate and many answers used specialist terms with confidence but a poor standard of handwriting made a number of answers difficult to mark and exacerbated the difficulty in understanding a badly-expressed answer.

The SPaGST marks may be affected if there are weaknesses in these areas:

- Appropriate use of capital letters.
- Correct use of apostrophes.
- Weak grammar ('would of', 'based off of') and casual language, which is not appropriate in an examination.
- Paragraphs: failure to structure answers in paragraphs not only affects the SPaGST mark, but may also make it difficult for the examiner to identify whether three different aspects have been covered in question 2, or how well analysis and evaluation is developed in question 3.

If extra paper is taken, students should state clearly in the answer space for the question that it has been continued and where the rest of the answer had been written; this should be on an additional sheet rather than elsewhere in the paper and should be clearly labelled.

However, in many cases where additional paper had been taken, the marks had already been attained within the space provided rather than on the extra paper and students should be discouraged from assuming that lengthy answers will automatically score highly. Indeed, students taking extra paper often ran out of time on the final, high mark question and therefore disadvantaged themselves.

Spelling, punctuation and grammar were assessed on 3(d) and the most impressive aspect of this strand was the use of specialist terms which perhaps reflects the detailed understanding many students had of this depth study.

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

