Pearson Edexcel

Mark Scheme (Results)

November 2020

Pearson Edexcel GCSE
In History (1HI0)
Paper 30: Modern depth study (1HI0)

Option 30: Russia and the Soviet Union, 1917–41

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

Autumn 2020
Publications Code 1HI0_30_2011_MS
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2020

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.

Modern depth study: Russia and the Soviet Union, 1917–41.

Question	
1	Give two things you can infer from Source A about the Bolshevik supporters during the seizure of power in October 1917. Target: Source analysis (making inferences). AO3: 4 marks.
Marking instructions	

Award 1 mark for each valid inference up to a maximum of two inferences. The second mark for each example should be awarded for supporting detail selected from the source.

e.g.

- *Bolshevik supporters hated the monarchy (1). The soldiers were driving bayonets through pictures of the Tsars (1).*
- *Bolshevik supporters were violent (1). They had weapons and caused much damage (1).*
- *Bolshevik supporters were well prepared (1).* They *were equipped with uniforms and guns (1).*

Accept other appropriate alternatives.

Question		
2		Explain why the Civil War broke out in 1918. You may use the following in your answer: • Czech Legion • Treaty of Brest-Litovsk You must also use information of your own. Target: Analysis of second order concepts: causation [AO2]; Knowledge and understanding of features and characteristics [AO1]. AO2: 6 marks. AO1: 6 marks.
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	• A simple or generalised answer is given, lacking development and organisation. [AO2] • Limited knowledge and understanding of the topic is shown. [AO1]
2	4–6	• An explanation is given, showing limited analysis and with implicit or unsustained links to the conceptual focus of the question. It shows some development and organisation of material, but a line of reasoning is not sustained. [AO2] • Accurate and relevant information is included, showing some knowledge and understanding of the period. [AO1] *Maximum 5 marks for Level 2 answers that do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.*
3	7–9	• An explanation is given, showing some analysis, which is mainly directed at the conceptual focus of the question. It shows a line of reasoning that is generally sustained, although some passages may lack coherence and organisation. [AO2] • Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of the required features or characteristics of the period studied. [AO1] *Maximum 8 marks for Level 3 answers that do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.*

4	10–12	• An analytical explanation is given which is directed consistently at the conceptual focus of the question, showing a line of reasoning that is coherent, sustained and logically structured. [AO2] • Accurate and relevant information is precisely selected to address the question directly, showing wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of the required features or characteristics of the period studied. [AO1] *No access to Level 4 for answers which do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.*

Marking instructions

Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance (page 3).

Performance in AO1 and AO2 is interdependent. An answer displaying no qualities of AO2 cannot be awarded more than the top of Level 1, no matter how strong performance is in AO1; markers should note that the expectation for AO1 is that candidates demonstrate both knowledge *and* understanding.

The middle mark in each level may be achieved by stronger performance in either AO1 or AO2.

Indicative content guidance

Answers must be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. While specific references are made in the indicative content below, this does not imply that these must be included; other relevant material must also be credited.

Relevant points may include:

- The trigger for the Civil War was the fight between local Soviets and the Czech Legion, a foreign army travelling across Russia to join the Allies on the Western Front, a development the Soviets much resented.
- The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk upset many in Russia, especially Nationalists who were then prepared to join with the Whites to attack the Bolsheviks.
- The Bolsheviks had failed to deal with food shortages and starvation so open challenges occurred in towns and cities.
- In 1918, the Whites, who opposed the Bolsheviks, felt strong enough to attack them as they had access to weapons, armed forces and foreign support.
- Left-wing groups, such as the Mensheviks and moderate SRs, took up arms against the Bolsheviks because they had abolished the Constituent Assembly and set up a dictatorship.

Question		
3 (a)		How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into conditions for workers in towns in the Soviet Union in the years 1928–41? Target: Analysis and evaluation of source utility. AO3: 8 marks.
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–2	• A simple judgement on utility is given, and supported by undeveloped comment on the content of the sources and/or their provenance[1]. Simple comprehension of the source material is shown by the extraction or paraphrase of some content. Limited contextual knowledge is deployed with links to the sources.
2	3–5	• Judgements on source utility for the specified enquiry are given, using valid criteria. Judgements are supported by developed comment related to the content of the sources and/or their provenance[1]. Comprehension and some analysis of the sources is shown by the selection and use of material to support comments on their utility. Contextual knowledge is used directly to support comments on the usefulness of the content of the sources and/or their provenance.
3	6–8	• Judgements on source utility for the specified enquiry are given, applying valid criteria with developed reasoning which takes into account how the provenance[1] affects the usefulness of the source content. The sources are analysed to support reasoning about their utility. Contextual knowledge is used in the process of interpreting the sources and applying criteria for judgements on their utility.

Notes
1. Provenance = nature, origin, purpose.

Marking instructions

Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance (page 3).

No credit may be given for contextual knowledge unless it is linked to evaluation of the sources.

No credit may be given for generic comments on provenance which are not used to evaluate source content.

Indicative content guidance

Answers must be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. While specific references are made in the indicative content below, this does not imply that these must be included; other relevant material must also be credited. The grouping of points below does not imply that this is how candidates are expected to structure their answers.

Source B

The usefulness could be identified in terms of the following points which could be drawn from the source:

- The source suggests a significant improvement in pay for workers.
- The source states that unemployment and its associated problems had been removed from the USSR.
- The source indicates that the living standards of the workers have improved year on year.

The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe usefulness to material drawn from it:

- As a propaganda speech it is useful for showing what Stalin wanted the Party to believe about living and working conditions in towns but may not reflect the true conditions at the time.
- The date of the speech in 1933 is useful because it provides an indication of conditions for workers at the end of the First Five Year Plan and the beginning of the Second Five Year Plan.

Knowledge of the historical context should be deployed to support inferences and/or to assess the usefulness of information. Relevant points may include:

- A free health service was introduced for workers as well as holidays with pay and an insurance scheme.
- Unemployment had been reduced as workers were moved around the country to places where they

were needed, e.g. to build and work in the city of Magnitogorsk.

Source C

The usefulness could be identified in terms of the following points which could be drawn from the source:

- The source indicates that the workers had lost many freedoms, such as the choice over where they worked and lived.
- The source claims that working conditions were poor with huge fines for lateness and dismissal for being sick.
- The source indicates that the whole family would suffer if a worker lost his job.

The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe usefulness to material drawn from it:

- Freda Utley was a British communist who was writing as an outsider.
- As a communist, Utley may be expected to praise the USSR but the extract is quite critical. This makes it more convincing.
- As someone who lived in Moscow, Freda Utley had personal experience of urban conditions.

Knowledge of the historical context should be deployed to support inferences and/or to assess the usefulness of information. Relevant points may include:

- Accommodation in towns was difficult to find and was of a very poor quality, with many people sharing facilities.
- A law was passed, which stated that if workers had one day off work without a good reason they lost their job, housing and ration card.

Question		
3 (b)		Study Interpretations 1 and 2. They give different views about conditions for workers in towns in the Soviet Union in the years 1928–41. What is the main difference between the views? Explain your answer, using details from both interpretations. Target: Analysis of interpretations (how they differ). AO4: 4 marks.
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–2	• Limited analysis of the interpretations is shown by the extraction or paraphrase of some content, but differences of surface detail only are given, or a difference of view is asserted without direct support.
2	3–4	• The interpretations are analysed and a key difference of view is identified and supported from them.

Marking instructions

Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance (page 3).

Indicative content guidance

Answers must be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.

- A main difference is that Interpretation 1 suggests conditions in towns were poor by mentioning the shortage of food and overcrowding. Interpretation 2, on the other hand, emphasises the improvements in conditions by mentioning more generous pay and promotions.

Question		
3 (c)		Suggest one reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about conditions for workers in towns in the Soviet Union in the years 1928-41. You may use Sources B and C to help explain your answer. Target: Analysis of interpretations (why they differ). AO4: 4 marks.
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–2	• A simple valid explanation is offered but displaying only limited analysis. Support for the explanation is based on simple undeveloped comment or on the selection of details from the provided material or own knowledge, with only implied linkage to the explanation.
2	3–4	• An explanation of a reason for difference is given, analysing the interpretations. The explanation is substantiated effectively.

Marking instructions

Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance (page 3).

Indicative content guidance

Answers must be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive. The examples below show different approaches to explaining difference, any one of which may be valid. Other valid material must be credited.

- The interpretations may differ because the authors have given weight to different sources. For example Source B, which provides evidence for the improvements made to conditions for workers, provides some support for Interpretation 2, while Source C, which emphasises the poor conditions found in the towns, provides some support for Interpretation 1.
- The interpretations may differ because the authors have been selective in their choice of information. Interpretation 2 appears to be using evidence for conditions only up to 1933, whereas Interpretation 1 appears to be using evidence for conditions throughout the time period 1928-41.
- They may differ because the authors have a different emphasis – Interpretation 1 is dealing with the negative conditions found in towns; Interpretation 2 is dealing with the positive conditions found in towns.

Question		
3 (d)		How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about conditions for workers in towns in the Soviet Union in the years 1928–41? Explain your answer, using both interpretations, and your knowledge of the historical context. Target: Analysis and evaluation of interpretations. AO4: 16 marks. Spelling, punctuation, grammar and the use of specialist terminology (SPaG): up to 4 additional marks.
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–4	• Answer offers simple valid comment to agree with or counter the interpretation. Limited analysis of one interpretation is shown by selection and inclusion of some detail in the form of simple paraphrase or direct quotation. Generalised contextual knowledge is included and linked to the evaluation.
2	5–8	• Answer offers valid evaluative comment to agree with or counter the interpretation. Some analysis is shown in selecting and including details from both interpretations to support this comment. Some relevant contextual knowledge is included and linked to the evaluation. An overall judgement is given but its justification is insecure or undeveloped and a line of reasoning is not sustained.
3	9–12	• Answer provides an explained evaluation, agreeing or disagreeing with the interpretation. Good analysis of the interpretations is shown indicating difference of view and deploying this to support the evaluation. Relevant contextual knowledge is used directly to support the evaluation. An overall judgement is given with some justification and a line of reasoning is generally sustained.
4	13–16	• Answer provides an explained evaluation reviewing the alternative views in coming to a substantiated judgement. Precise analysis of the interpretations is shown, indicating how the differences of view are conveyed and deploying this material to support the evaluation. Relevant contextual knowledge is precisely selected to support the evaluation. An overall judgment is justified and the line of reasoning is coherent, sustained and logically structured.
Marks for SPaG		
Performance	Mark	Descriptor
	0	• The learner writes nothing. • The learner's response does not relate to the question. • The learner's achievement in SPaG does not reach the threshold performance level, e.g. errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar severely hinder meaning.
Threshold	1	• Learners spell and punctuate with reasonable accuracy. • Learners use rules of grammar with some control of meaning and any errors do not significantly hinder meaning overall. • Learners use a limited range of specialist terms as appropriate.
Intermediate	2–3	• Learners spell and punctuate with considerable accuracy. • Learners use rules of grammar with general control of meaning overall. • Learners use a good range of specialist terms as appropriate.
High	4	• Learners spell and punctuate with consistent accuracy. • Learners use rules of grammar with effective control of meaning overall. • Learners use a wide range of specialist terms as appropriate.

Marking instructions

Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance (page 3).

No credit may be given for contextual knowledge unless it is linked to evaluation of the interpretations.

In all levels, the second sentence relates to analysis and while the rest relate to evaluation. The following rules will apply:

- In Level 1, answers that meet the requirements only in relation to analysis without evidence of evaluation should be awarded 1 mark.
- In other levels, answers that meet the requirements only in relation to analysis (but that also fully meet the descriptors for evaluation of the level below) should be awarded no more than the bottom mark in the level.

Indicative content guidance

Answers must be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. While specific references are made in the indicative content below, this does not imply that these must be included; other relevant material must also be credited. The grouping of points below does not imply that this is how candidates are expected to structure their answers.

The interpretation to be evaluated suggests that conditions for workers in towns improved.

Relevant points from the provided material and own knowledge which support the claim made in the interpretation may include:

- Interpretation 2 supports the claim that conditions in urban areas improved by highlighting the improved pay workers received.
- Interpretation 2 supports the claim by mentioning the improved educational opportunities that were available for the children of workers.
- The Stakhanovite Movement encouraged industrial workers to exceed their targets. Those who did so received rewards.
- Sport and exercise were encouraged with trade unions providing clubs, access to sports facilities and a range of entertainment for workers in the towns.
- The state claimed that there were jobs for everyone with no official, or recorded, unemployment.

Relevant points from the provided material and own knowledge which counter the view may include:

- Interpretation 1 suggests that working conditions were harsh and there was no opportunity for conditions or the pay to be improved through strikes.
- Interpretation 1 highlights the appalling living conditions in the towns, mentioning overcrowding and poor facilities.
- Housing conditions for workers in towns were very poor, e.g. in Moscow only six percent of householders lived in more than one room.
- Food was in short supply in urban areas. Between 1928 and 1933, the consumption of meat, fruit and milk in Leningrad declined by 66%.
- Many towns and cities could not cope with the rapid population growth, so roads, the water supply, power and transport were insufficient. In some areas sewage systems or street lights were absent.

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