

Commentary on candidate evidence

Candidate 1 – Part A: Historical Issues

The evidence for this candidate was placed within the following mark ranges for each question of this course assessment component.

Question 66: How significant was the role of leadership in determining the outcome of the Civil War?

Structure: Introduction

The candidate was awarded credit in the **20-22 mark range** because the introduction was relevant, and analytical addressing a number of debates, and the main interpretations were prioritised. Lines 1-3 (page 1, paragraph 1) display the importance of the Civil War and it is set in historical context using historian Richard Pipes' interpretation. In lines 4-7 the main points are identified, which are all relevant. The isolated factor of 'leadership' is clearly addressed. Lines 7-10 address the main historical debates Carr versus Pipes on why the Reds won and in Lines 10-12 an overall evaluative statement is made.

Structure: Conclusion

The candidate was awarded credit in the **20-22 mark range** because they make an overall judgement on the issue. Synthesis is evident as well as evaluation of the key issues. An evaluation is made stating that a combination of factors led to Red victory. Synthesis and evaluation of the isolated factor are evident where the candidate discusses the reasons why leadership, foreign intervention and White failures are relevant but not as significant as geographical advantage. The candidate makes an overall conclusion supported by historians' views that Red geographical advantage was the most significant factor.

Thoroughness/relevance of information and approach

The candidate was awarded credit in the **20-22 mark range** because there is width and depth of knowledge and evidence of good research. The candidate uses width and depth citing disunity amongst the white forces as a major factor; exemplifying ideological differences, poor communications between armies and strategic problems. In terms of balance the candidate goes on to give a detailed counter argument about the early successes of Kornilov's forces. Here the candidate uses a wide range of evidence and then goes into depth about each one.

Analysis, evaluation and line of argument

The candidate was awarded credit in the **20-22 mark range** because there is a firm grasp of the evaluative aims of the question and assured and consistent control of arguments and issues. For example, the candidate is fluent and

insightful outlining Trotsky's leadership as a major factor. This argument is supported by detailed evidence to reinforce the analysis as well as current historiography. Then Trotsky's leadership is evaluated using the historian Mawdsley to question how significant Trotsky actually was. Synthesis is also used when referring to the views of Soviet historiography. The section is concluded with an overall evaluation of Trotsky's leadership in the wider context of why the Reds won – the candidate builds their argument throughout this section. We see this pattern of evaluation throughout in the form of arguments for and against an issue and qualitative judgements made.

Historical sources/interpretations

The candidate was awarded credit in the **20-22 mark range** because there is a sound knowledge and understanding of historians' interpretations throughout the piece. The main historical arguments are led by comparing historians' views (in lines 8-9 of the introductory paragraph). In the second paragraph (lines 23-26) we also see the conflicting views of Service versus Mawdsley to measure the importance of Trotsky's leadership. Interpretations are led and evaluated using historians throughout page 2 of the response as well.

Candidate 1 – Part B: Historical Sources

The evidence for this candidate was placed within the following mark ranges for each question of this course assessment component.

Question 70: Evaluate the usefulness of Source A as evidence of the problems facing the Provisional Government between February and October 1917.

Provenance

Two out of a possible three marks are given for provenance because there are two examples of provenance. Firstly, the candidate identifies the significance of the Kadets as a political grouping and why their eyewitness evidence is significant – this gets one mark for provenance and secondly the candidate discusses the comprehensive nature of the source and the lack of bias in the intention of the source.

Question 71: How much do Sources B and C reveal about differing interpretations of the reasons why Stalin rather than Trotsky emerged victorious in the leadership struggle?

Interpretations

Six out of a possible six marks are given for source interpretation.

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** for interpreting Source B. The candidate puts the source into their own words to explain how Stalin's sphere of influence over the party increased. The candidate also explains how the small party of Lenin changes into the mass party loyal to Stalin and the candidate develops the content of the source to explain how the party became more bureaucratic and extended Stalin's powerbase.

The candidate is then awarded a **further 3 marks** for interpreting Source C. The candidate interprets the source to identify how Stalin sidelined Trotsky and puts the source into his/her own words to explain the importance of the ban on factionalism. The final interpretation mark is given in the paragraph beginning 'However, although the source does mention' for Stalin's tactics to outmanoeuvre other opponents and uses wider contextual development to set this in context.

Question 72: How fully does Source D explain the reasons for Soviet victory in the Great Patriotic War?

The candidate gains a maximum of 3 marks for interpreting the source and 7 marks for wider contextual development which is not in the source.

The candidate was awarded a mark for interpretation and wider contextual development. In the first paragraph (lines 1-3) the candidate highlights the concept of 'the total war economy' from the source. A wider contextual development mark is then given for explaining what this meant (in lines 4-5).

Another example of the candidate showing how fully the source explains the reasons for Soviet Victory is exemplified in the first the third paragraph. Lines 6-9 highlight that the source mentions the resilience of the Russian people as a factor. In lines 10-11 this is developed using wider contextual development which addresses casualty figures.

Finally the candidate shows how fully the source explains the reasons for Soviet victory in the fifth paragraph (lines 14-16) citing Russian propaganda and patriotism as a key factor. Then this is developed in lines 17-18 using a specific account gaining a wider contextual development mark and another wider contextual development mark is developed in lines 19-21 about patriotism and the Russian Orthodox Church.

The candidate goes on to identify number of factors which are not mentioned in the source at all and these points of wider contextual development give a fuller account of the reasons for Soviet victory. Wider contextual development marks are given in; lines 22-24 about the impact of Stalin's speeches, lines 24-25 explaining order 227. This continues until the very end of the answer.

Good use of historians

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** for using historians effectively. On the first page of the response (lines 12-13) McCauley is used to develop the point of wider contextual development in lines 10-11 about the relationship between the people and the Russian leadership during the war.

On the second page of the response the views of Ward and Figes are used to support the fact that Nazi weaknesses were key to Soviet victory which is given a mark for historians, but it also is a development of the wider contextual development mark given in lines 32-36 on the first page of the response.