



# **Examiners' Report**

## **June 2024**

**GCE History 9HI0 38**

## 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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2024

Publications Code 9HI0\_38\_2406\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

## Introduction

Candidates across the ability range continue to be able to engage effectively with the A Level Paper 38 which deals with The Making of Modern Russia, 1855-1991 (38.1) and The Making of Modern China, 1860-1997 (38.2).

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A contains a compulsory question which is based on two enquiries linked to one source. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts – cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Section C comprises a choice of essays that relate to aspects of the process of change over a period of at least 100 years (AO1).

Most candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and there was little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt all three sections of the paper within the time allocated, although a very small number did not complete their response to Section C. There continues to be an increase this year in the number of scripts that were seen that posed problems for examiners with a lack of legibility of handwriting, some of which were almost entirely indecipherable. Examiners are only able to give credit for what they can read. There was some evidence this summer of a number of candidates abbreviating words that should not be abbreviated in formal written English, eg the use of gov instead of government. This is not a development that is welcomed.

In Section A, the strongest answers demonstrated an ability to draw out and develop reasoned inferences from the source for both enquiries and to evaluate the source thoroughly in relation to the demands of the two enquiries on the basis of both contextual knowledge and the nature, origin and purpose of the source. Some candidates continue to use their contextual knowledge to describe events, sometimes with only tangential links to what is in the source, in great detail, rather than using it to illuminate and to discuss the sources. This sometimes resulted in candidates not dealing with the source adequately. In other cases, candidates might offer up no contextual knowledge to support their arguments and analysis. It is disappointing to note that a number of candidates did not explicitly address the focus of at least one of the enquiries or that candidates overlooked some element of the question. Some responses were seen where candidates dismissed one of the enquiries as having no material available for it. This will never be the case – both enquiries always have some relevant material, even though it is not necessarily always balanced.

In Section B, examiners were impressed by the number of responses that clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question and shaped their responses appropriately to meet the demands of the question. It continues to be the case that a number of responses were seen that had a tendency to only deal with one side of an argument; some of these were very impressive in dealing with that one side, showing the links between the issues that were raised, but it is essential that candidates acknowledge the existence of a counter argument, where appropriate. Candidates need to be aware of the chronological parameters of questions and to ensure that they write across the chronology. Equally, the evidence that is presented should come from within the timeframe of the chronology of the question.

In Section C, most candidates were able to engage with the elements of the process of change that are central in this section of the examination. This is a breadth question and the questions that are set encompass a minimum of 100 years. Candidates are reminded again that this has important implications for the higher levels in bullet point 2 of the mark scheme. To access bullet point 2 at level 5 candidates are expected to have responded 'fully' to the demands of the question. The requirements of questions will vary and key developments relating to the question may be more specific to the entire chronological range in some questions and options than in others. However, it was judged not possible for candidates to have 'fully met' the demands of any section C question unless at least 75% of the chronological range of the question was addressed. To access bullet point 2 at level 4 candidates need to meet most of the demands of the question. It was unlikely that most of the demands of the question would be met if the answer had a restricted range that covered less than 60% of its chronology.

## Question 1

There were some very good responses to this question. Most candidates were able to make inferences from the source with regard to Khrushchev's criticisms of Stalin during the 'secret speech', eg his introduction of the personality cult and the use of extra judicial methods against 'enemies of the people', and many inferred also a range of aims of de-Stalinisation. Some sound contextual knowledge was added to these inferences, with reference, for example, to Khrushchev's 'Thaw' in subsequent years. When considering the use of the source to the enquiry, there were some convincing comments made about Khrushchev's part in Stalin's tyranny and his wish to distance himself from the likes of Molotov and Malenkov in the race for power.

On the other hand, weaker responses had a weaker understanding of the USSR in this period and struggled to make use of the source as a result. Comments on the nature, origin or purpose of the source were often generic and not applied in coming to a judgement on its use to the enquiries specified in the question. A significant minority of candidates neglected to make any developed comment on the utility of the source.

Overall, the source is highly useful to understand both ~~the~~ Khrushchev's criticisms of Stalin and to a lesser extent, the aims of destalinisation. From the Pospelov Report, this speech is incredibly useful to understand the extent of Stalin's abuses of power. However, the aims of destalinisation can only be fully understood through inferences of in what ways Stalin corrupted the party and his power.

Khrushchev's criticisms of Stalin were extremely significant as, in this speech, he sought to distance himself from Stalin and other wing Presidium members in order to appeal to the new

generation of Shestidesiatniki as well as his abundance of grass root support already in the party. Khrushchev, in the secret speech, condemns Stalin for ~~'physicard'~~ or 'physical and mental torture' through creating his concept of 'enemy of the people'. We know that the origins of the Secret Speech were in the Pospelov report which aimed to investigate repression of Soviet party members from 1935-40 and so it would have included details of obvious abuses of power like the Leningrad Affair or the Doctor's Plot. We know that Stalin was a paranoid individual and utilized the NKVD and Yezhov to harness any 'enemy of the people' for almost any reason at all; and these are the 'victims' to which Khrushchev alludes here. Furthermore, Khrushchev's criticism of Stalin for 'covering up failures' also alludes to ~~Khrushchev's hatred of the Five Year Plans under Stalin~~ the failure of the Five Year Plans under Stalin as many factory managers would falsify results to produce exorbitant industry statistics. However, the true extent of Khrushchev's criticisms of Stalin cannot be fully known through this speech to the Central Committee; it is certainly true Khrushchev was ~~not~~ willing to ~~allow~~ condemn Stalin to gain power himself however

Khrushchev had flourished under Stalin and was no less complicit in similar crimes, suggesting his words here were for only expedient purposes to gain power at the decisive moment he said them. At the same time, Khrushchev had to not condemn Stalin so much ~~that~~ that he ~~perceived~~ criticised the core nature of the Bolshevike regime (as affirmed by his ~~saying~~ approval of Leninism). Thus, this source is completely useful to understand the nature of ~~the~~ Khrushchev's criticism of Stalin, although the transparency and completeness of his judgement can be questioned.

With regards to the aims of de-Stalinisation, the source is much more vague and we can only gauge an idea through inference of what Stalin damaged, according to Khrushchev's view. Linking back to the Criticism of Stalin, the Pospelov Report (which made up great volumes of the Secret speech) was designed to investigate Stalin's crimes ~~and not~~ but not how this would be interpreted and used by Khrushchev. The nature of the source makes it directly less useful for an enquiry to <sup>aims of</sup> de-Stalinisation. However, from assessing the severity Khrushchev offers to the danger of 'cult of personality' and his reference to following 'written rules' we can infer that

he intended to favour ~~the~~ incentivisation and freedom over violence and repression as Stalin had. ~~Khrushchev~~ ~~did expand party membership from 7 to 11 million~~ Khrushchev did move the powers of the security status from the MVD to the KGB and banned secret trials or execution without proper trial. Thus, the speech does attest to changes ~~in~~ by Khrushchev, suggesting its utility in this regard. Moreover, Khrushchev speaks of change 'from the bottom to the top of the party' - ~~as a result~~ in his rule he did expand party membership from 7 to 11 million and provide supervisory roles for non-party members. ~~These~~ The source and this knowledge together suggest that an aim of destalinisation was to increase transparency through increasing rigour of the legal system as well as increasing political participation. ~~Overall however,~~ Moreover, his reference to Stalin's inability to improve 'economic activity' or 'initiative to work' also ~~in~~ perhaps infers that ~~Stalin~~ <sup>Khrushchev</sup> wished to improve these areas through destalinisation. Khrushchev did create Sovnarkhozy councils to provide working class people a platform to change and input concerns in the workplace. Though the inferred aims of destalinisation do in most cases attest to the reforms which Khrushchev

brought in, this does not mean that these objectively were his aims as the speech's purpose was never to explicitly tell us. However, the source is still relatively useful to understand what his aims of destalinisation might be, but not as definitely as his criticism of Stalin.

In conclusion, this extract from the secret speech ~~was~~ is useful to understand the Khrushchev's criticism of Stalin more so than his aims of destalinisation. The Pospelov Report from which the speech is based, alongside Khrushchev's personal voice, show his view of blatant abuses of power made under Stalin. It can be said that Khrushchev's position in vying for power perhaps ~~emphasised his~~ exaggerated his thoughts or even dampened them as Khrushchev could only deviate from the party line so far. Overall, it does not detract from its utility in this line of inquiry. ~~Stalin~~ Khrushchev's aims of destalinisation are less clear as we can only infer from his criticism of Stalin what they might be and then relate them to future reforms he made. In every case, Khrushchev's reforms do attest to the aims inferred in the speech, indicating a moderate degree of utility in the

source for this line of enquiry. Nonetheless, it is still less crystal clear of his aims compared with his criticism of Stalin.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response makes reasoned inferences from the source content with regard to both enquiries. It adds relevant contextual knowledge to illuminate what can be gained from the source with reference to the question and, in evaluation, makes valid comments on Khrushchev's motives for making the speech at this time. An attempt is also made to address the weight that the source bears in relation to the enquiries. It was awarded a safe L5 mark.

## Question 2

This question was often answered very well. The stronger candidates made reasoned inferences with regard to China's position in world affairs in the aftermath of Mao's death and used knowledge of the historical context to illuminate the content of the source. When considering the purposes of China's foreign policy, most were able to draw out from the source the primacy of economic development to Deng and to expand on the need for more constructive relationships with the USA in particular. Many noted the tone and language of Deng's comments, and the nature of his audience, in attempting to weigh the value of the source to the two enquiries.

Weaker responses often tended to paraphrase the source content. Comments on the nature, origin or purpose of the source were often generic and not applied in coming to a judgement on its use to the two enquiries.

The source is very valuable for revealing both China's position in international affairs in the early 1980's and the aims of its foreign policy as it shows comments made by Deng at a meeting ~~that~~ <sup>with</sup> ~~were~~ the UN secretary general that were then broadcast. ~~Thus~~ <sup>This</sup> we are made aware of how China wishes to present itself to the world.

it is valuable as

The source is very valuable for revealing China's position in ~~foreign~~ <sup>international</sup> affairs in the early 1980's for a number of reasons. In the opening line Deng states "China is a permanent member of the UN security council". This <sup>makes the source</sup> ~~is~~ valuable as it shows China's new position in international affairs since prior to this China was not a permanent member. This comment therefore shows that China <sup>is now</sup> ~~an~~ an equal among other international powers. Secondly, ~~the~~ Deng's comments about "superpowers [taking] advantage of conflicts between Third World countries in order to achieve objectives" shows that China is aware

it has been subject to unfair Treatment in the past and that China in its new ~~position~~ position of power refuses to let this happen again. Thus this again makes the source very valuable as it shows Chinas increased role in international affairs. Finally Deng's comments about how "Third World political influence has risen considerably" and "we need to shake off our backwardness" makes the source valuable as it considers the growth of Chinese influence even though economic development has not yet reached the levels of other international powers.

However the source ~~is~~ has limitations due to ~~its~~ <sup>its</sup> provenance. The fact that the source comes directly from the leader of China limits its value as Deng understandably wants to praise China and remove previous judgements about Chinas place in international affairs. Thus it is possible that he exaggerates China's influence on the world stage.

The source is also very valuable in revealing

the aims of China's foreign policy as much of the speech focuses on China's desire for peace. Comments like "China hopes for peace more than anything else" and "wish to safeguard the world peace" make the source very valuable as they directly show China's desire for peace is central to its foreign policy. The source also reveals China's plans to modernise are another important aspect of foreign policy, making it very valuable. Deng states "the primary task we have is modernising China is to create greater prosperity by the end of the century" and later "our foreign policy supports this goal [economic development]". These comments make the source very valuable as they show how China's desire for peace is directly linked to its need to modernise to prevent future humiliation.

However the source has some limitations due to its nature. The fact that these comments come from a meeting Deng had with the Secretary General of the UN Security Council could impact Deng's

emphasis on China ~~being~~ desiring peace and stating "everyone can trust China". The fact that these statements were then broadcast internationally limit the value of the source because as China is a new member of the Security Council ~~they~~ <sup>it is</sup> ~~are~~ <sup>towards</sup> therefore expected to act with respect ~~and~~ <sup>other members</sup> ~~mean~~ so perhaps it could be said that Deng's words are emphasised ~~or~~ show.

Nevertheless the source is very valuable. Its provenance and nature, while creating limitations to its usefulness do not detract from the value of its content and the fact that it comes ~~in~~ <sup>several</sup> ~~many~~ years after the death of Mao,\* proving that perhaps Deng's words are the reality. The source reveals both how China feels about past conflicts and how it is prepared to tackle future ones in its new ~~new~~ position in international affairs as a respected country, making it very valuable overall.

\* and in the midst of Deng's reforms



Here the candidate does address their answer to both enquiries and makes several inferences from the content of the source. Some contextual knowledge is added to support some of these inferences, though this is fairly limited. An attempt is made to take into account the nature of the source when addressing its utility to the question, but this has limited justification. It received a low L4 mark.

### Question 3

This was the more popular essay in Section B of Paper 38.1 and there was a range of good answers that scored in Level 4 and Level 5. Such answers were able to use sound knowledge to analyse significance of Alexander II's army reforms alongside his other political reforms of the period, displaying knowledge and understanding before coming to reasoned judgements. Weaker answers tended to recount the details of the army reforms without real depth or precision. Rather than coming to a reasoned judgement, these tended to rely on assertion.

Overall, army reforms under Alexander II were not the most significant compared with the effects of legal reform which I believe, although unintentionally, changed the political atmosphere within Russia irreversibly. This being said, military reforms were still a pivotal change and had extensive impact particularly in the mechanism of conscription and military education. Therefore, military reforms are less significant <sup>than</sup> legal reforms but more important than reforms made to local government ~~of~~ or ~~freedom of expression.~~ education.

The ineptitude of the organisation of the army could be seen clearly throughout the Crimean War with arsenals containing only half the weapons they were meant to due to corruption and bribery in the supply chain. Moreover, command of the army was through ill-trained nobility, favoured for their connections rather than merit as soldiers. The haphazard command paired with ~~an~~ almost life-long conscription to the army in the peasant class shows the dramatic extent of reform which cannot be underestimated compared with previous practices.

Garrison schools which favoured nobility were replaced by junker schools which allowed uptake of non-noble soldiers to officer class. Furthermore, education of men was encouraged through reduced conscription terms, the more highly the man was educated: this could be as low as 18 months for a university educated individual which was a significant change in the makeup of the army. Moreover, elements of democracy were brought in where only 4 out of every 1000 eligible men were picked to join the army, randomly and harsh corporal punishment was abolished. In this way, the nature of the army's conscription and education changed drastically under Alexander II and its success ~~at~~ can be seen through Russia's victory.

against Turkey 1877-78. However, these reforms were reversed quickly by Alexander III in 1881 and many of its key features removed, reducing its long term and overall impact on the wider population.

Legal reforms under Alexander II were more crucial than army reforms because they had a profound political effect on the population which could not be reversed, unlike the military ones, under Alexander III. Court proceedings under Nicholas I were opaque and unequal: judges were often illiterate and open to bribes and women or peasants would have no representation in court. An entire restructuring of the legal system was imposed where now a jury would come to a verdict and lawyers ~~too~~ and judges would represent clients and be members of Bar Councils. The 'advokatura' was the new class of legal professional which, not intentionally by Alexander II, became a ~~growing~~ breeding ground for political thinking with centres in Moscow, St Petersburg, and Karkov. Alexander hastily tried to reverse the Bar Council's influence by banning new branches opening but its new political effects were massive. The new jury system often tried to prove a defendant's innocence of political crime even if they were clearly guilty - ie. in the case of Vera Zasulich and her murder of Trepov. Thus,

legal reforms unleashed a new political atmosphere on the population which could not be reversed by Tsars. However, this did only directly affect 20% of the population with the remainder being tried in volost courts, but I feel the new atmosphere of political leniency would have been felt here, even if not formally so. Making legal reforms the most significant of all.

Two statutes of local government were brought out in Alexander II's reign: the Zemstvo statute in 1864 and the Municipal statute in 1870. These changed the hierarchy of governance in both rural areas with the introduction of ~~rural~~ district and provincial ~~dumas~~ and zemstvos and in the cities with dumas. Particularly in the countryside, these had a large effect with peasantry gaining 40% representation in district zemstvos compared with their being slaves to the land a mere 5 years earlier before the Emancipation edict. Zemstva focused on public health and education with 613 doctors being employed and increase of number of primary schools to 23,000 by 1874. However, local government was less extensive in cities with nobility being overrepresented at every

voting level and thus no significant change in quality of life being made compared to changes in military or local government. However, the fact the peasantry received any representation politically was truly an innovation and so is a noteworthy change in attitude, similar to the political effect of legal reforms.

Education The University Statute of 1863 had limited impact as Golevnik's reforms only lasted until 1866 when he was replaced by reactionary ~~re~~ Dmitri Tolstoi. Briefly, it allowed lectures and academic materials to be transported from abroad as well as a generous subsidy system which favoured non-nobility students, supporting 40% of the pupil body. However, this was severely restricted after the 1866 assassination attempt with internal passports and profiling done on students as well as admission tests being made harder to favour children of nobility. Thus, although education reforms had a brief impact on freedom of thought in the student body, their long-term impact on the structure of universities and the wider population was limited, making them less significant than military, legal, or local government reforms.

In conclusion, military reforms certainly did perform a long lasting and significant change to the system of conscription and military education as well as addressing ~~and~~ attitudes within the army. However, these reforms did not ~~quite~~ bring into question new political thinking or further reform as legal ~~or~~ ones did. Legal reform was absolutely the most crucial as it, inadvertently, promoted free thinking and long-lasting changes in political atmosphere. ~~The~~ Local government and education reform made some key impacts to the public's lives but these were not as long-lasting or extensive as legal reforms, or even military reform.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response sustains an analytical focus on the key issues relevant to the question and examines the relationship between them in coming to a judgement. Sufficient knowledge is deployed to respond fully to the demands of the question. Valid criteria are established in coming to a judgement and their relative significance is evaluated in substantiating its conclusions. The argument is logical throughout, and communicated with clarity. It received a high L5 mark.

## Question 4

This question was often done very well. The reasons for the collapse of Soviet communism were often known in some detail, notably long-term economic stagnation, the effects of the Afghanistan War, and the impact of nationalism in the Soviet republics. Many candidates also knew about Gorbachev and his role in the liquidation of the USSR. What was less common was an ability to link all these factors more directly to the collapse of 1991.

Weaker answers frequently knew little that was precise and accurate about the USSR in the 1980s, and were unable to come to a reasoned judgement.

It is right to say the collapse of the USSR was down to factors beyond Gorbachev's control, ~~from the~~ Some of these factors include, the constant stagnation of the economy left behind by previous rulers, the Afghan war and Russia's backwardness compared to other superpowers. However some may say it was down to Gorbachev's handling of the Chernobyl disaster or the effects of Alcohol in the Russian Society.

Firstly, the economic stagnation in Russia was a key reason for the collapse of Soviet communism. Previous leaders before Gorbachev, left the country in a terrible state where the main source of money came from the peasants and their farms which was still very small, and the addition of wars throughout this time left the country drained of all her resources. This led to the end of Soviet Russia as the hole that was dug, was too deep for Gorbachev to get his way out of leading to the ~~end~~ collapse. Secondly, the Afghan war was also a key reason for the collapse of Soviet

Russia as the war took money and drained resources from the country until Gorbachev came into power and he pulled them out. The ~~re~~ returning soldiers, Afghanistan were left with no jobs and little money leading to a high crime rates and more protests. The war add to the already damaged economy and left Russia in a much worse state.

On the otherhand, there were factors that led to the collapse of the USSR that ~~were~~ were in the hands of Gorbachev. Firstly, the event of Chernobyl left Russia and the surrounding areas in a state of crisis through the mass amount of radiation ~~coming~~ coming from the plant. The Russian government decided to keep this ~~quite~~ quiet ~~at~~ and evacuated their families before letting the country know. This went against all aspects of Gorbachev's rule as his idea of Glasnost (openness) was broken and it wasn't until other countries in Europe began to notice the amount of radiation in the air that they decide to tell others about what went off. Secondly, the long lasting affect of Alcohol ~~is~~ in Russian society was a key reason for why the USSR collapsed. During the Terror instating rule, Russian people

found a way of dealing with it, which was alcohol. This allowed them to get through the long days filled with horror but left them becoming lazy and poor workers.

Overall, I believe that the collapse of the Soviet communism was not down to Gorbachev but down to factors outside his control such as the economic stagnation.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This answer identifies various key factors that are relevant to the question. Mostly accurate knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the conceptual focus of the question, but the answer generally lacks depth. There is an attempt throughout to establish criteria for judgement though the judgement is, overall, weakly substantiated. It was given a low L4 mark.

## Question 5

This was by far the less popular of the questions in Section B of Paper 38.2 and strong answers were relatively few. Some did address directly the impact of foreign language schools in the 1860s, most concluding that, given their number, this was limited, at least in the short-term. The weaker responses often lacked depth and accuracy, and sometimes attempted to turn this into a multi-factor question, considering briefly the impact of foreign language schools alongside, for example, the impact of Christian missionaries during the period.

It can be argued that foreign language schools had little impact in China in the years 1860-70 due to other organisational movements having a stronger impact on Chinese society. For example, the Catholic missionary movements conforming Chinese individuals into the belief system based around the idea of salvation. These Catholic ideologies, can be seen to have a stronger impact on Chinese society due to their teachings being so prominent, as well as among all sectors in society, whereby the prominence formed from the Protestant way of printing literature and sending out for free, as well as the Catholic spread of ideas in dominant ways. For example Christian teachings were taught into the youth via education within schools. In particular Protestant schools would translate Western sciences, so Chinese youth had a stronger idea of Western culture, and this ultimately resulted in a driving force among

Chinese youth to modernise China and ultimately led to a new generation who wanted modernisation and the adoption of Western style culture.

In addition, missionaries, in particular Protestant missionaries had a prominent impact on Chinese societies, particularly women

as they offered a safe environment away from the majority of patriarchal oppression.

Therefore, leading women to adopt Protestant ideologies and advocate Chinese modernisation

However, it could still be argued <sup>foreign language</sup> ~~schools~~

In addition, the transmission of culture from foreign countries may have presented foreign language schools to have little impact in

China in the years 1860-70 due to the new lifestyle Western modernisation brought being more significant for modernisation than

foreign language schools, arguably because schools only benefit a minority in society

(the youth) whereas culture can positively

impact all age groups. For example Britain's dominance in the Yangtze valley and

Shanghai brought new culture for Chinese

people to enjoy and explore, pressing the need for these Chinese citizens to want the whole of China westernised. For example in Shanghai, there was the introduction of British style entertainment, like horse racing, cricket and tennis clubs, and bars. Ultimately creating a more fun society for the Chinese to enjoy. Therefore, this shows that foreign language schools had little impact due to cultural society being more interesting to a Chinese population and enabled an exciting environment for all to enjoy.

However, it could be argued that foreign language schools in China in the years 1860-70, had the opposite effect of little impact, and instead had great impact towards a modernised China, due to the new type of schools creating a new learning culture and a wider curriculum, allowing for a more qualified education at the end. Where, before the introduction of foreign language schools, education was based on civil service exams, and the only thing needed to pass was knowledge of Chinese classics and calligraphy. Therefore there was a very limited scope of education and learning. However,

after the introduction of foreign language schools, with the first one being set up in Beijing by prince Gong (Fou Tonguen Guan) and based around tutors to teach foreign languages, primarily English and French, as well as diversification of subjects, such as science, medicine, astrology and maths. This ultimately resulted in a more Westernly modernised China with a more qualified society, where these Chinese citizens pushed for further modernisation, which resulted in schools opening to learn about Western technology and leading to new weapon development centres, such as Fozoun Navy Shipyard and Nanjing Arsenal. Therefore, it can be argued that actually foreign language schools ~~was~~ had a huge impact in China in the years 1860-70 due to not only creating a more modernised thinking & wanting society, but also due to further modernisation returns that stemmed from the creation of foreign language schools. However, it can still be suggested that foreign language schools did have little impact in 1860-1870 due to the fact that not enough youth had been attending them yet to make

huge advocations in favour of western modernisation,  
So it had not yet become a massive movement.  
This means that in late years when more  
generations had attended the Foreign language  
Schools, did the need for more across china  
grow and the ideology of modernised schools grow.

To conclude, although it can be said that Foreign  
Language Schools did have little impact in  
China in the years 1860 - 70 due to ~~the~~ how  
new the modernisation was, as well as other  
Organisations and ideologies having more power  
in Society at the time, it can still be argued  
that the introduction of foreign language  
schools did have a hugely significant impact  
due to modernising western ideologies into the  
youth and increasing their aspirations for a  
modernised China, resulting in a new generation  
advocating it.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This low L4 answer raises key issues that are relevant to the question though the knowledge it deploys lacks depth and, on occasion, material is included which drifts from its conceptual focus. Although it does establish criteria for judgement, overall, this is weakly substantiated.

## Question 6

This was the more popular question in Section B of Paper 38.2 and was often done very well indeed. Many candidates had a very impressive knowledge of the Sino-Soviet split and were able not just to evidence Mao's responsibility in some detail but also a range of other potential causes, before coming to reasoned conclusions. On this point, some answers would have benefitted from, perhaps, more planning, and a more analytic framework that would have done more justice to what they knew. Weaker answers often knew something of the Sino-Soviet split but a lack of depth of knowledge, and accuracy, was often a serious impediment.

The breakdown in relations between China and the USSR, in the years 1958-69, were partially due to the personality of Chairman Mao. But other factors such as reform, nuclear weapons and ideologies also played significant roles.

Chairman Mao had become very harsh and distrusting. He had built strong relations with the USSR during Stalin's time, but once Khrushchev took over after Stalin's death, the Sino-Soviet split ~~occurred~~ began to occur. Mao didn't trust anyone who went against him, and many who did were punished by severe treatment or death. It is believed that Mao is responsible for the deaths of millions but chose to stay ignorant, and ignored the suffering of the Chinese people. Despite Mao and Khrushchev having contrasting personalities, I don't believe this was the most important cause of the breakdown in relations between China and the USSR in the years 1958-69.

Another reason for the breakdown in relations between China and the USSR is the difference in ideologies. Mao was very focused on socialism and reform, but after Stalin died the USSR criticised Mao as he wasn't following pure Marxist-Leninism. The clash of

ideologies caused tension to grow between China and the USSR. This was made worse after the Malinovsky affair, when a politician said "we got rid of our fool" and suggested China should do the same. Mao felt his power and security threatened, especially as he was aware how strong the USSR were. This incident and ideology clash contributed to Mao's harsh personality as he was growing increasingly intimidated and felt his position of power was being threatened by the Soviets. So, the personality and ideologies of Chairman Mao are a valid reason for the breakdown in relations between China and the USSR in the years 1958-69.

An alternative reason for the breakdown in relations between China and the USSR is the role of nuclear weapons. The USSR had been promising nuclear weapons to China for years, but China never received them. Mao believed that the world needed a nuclear war, and was frustrated that the USSR had continuously made empty promises. During the Sino-Indian War the USSR had supported India with nuclear weapons. This was a breaking point for relations. After the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, Mao no longer had any access or permission to have nuclear weapons. This significantly impacted relations between China and the USSR. Despite Chinese engineers being able to collect and repair Soviet blueprints, they still had weak technology so struggled to manufacture weapons (including nuclear weapons). I believe

that the role of nuclear weapons was more significant than the roles of Mao's personality and differing ideologies for the breakdown in relations between China and the USSR in the years 1958-69.

Another alternative is the role of ~~other~~ and influence of other foreign countries. After USSR advisors left China in 1960, China began to create stronger relations with other nations, for example the United States. The United States were strongly opposed to the USSR, so their influence may have had an effect on Chinese views on the Soviets. However, this is not as significant as personality, ideology, and nuclear weapons for the breakdown.

In conclusion, I do not agree that the breakdown in relations between China and the USSR, in the years 1958-69, was due to the personality of Chairman Mao. Despite personality playing a role, I believe the most significant reason is the role of nuclear weapons, because it caused high levels of tension between China and the USSR, consequently leading to the breakdown of relations.



This answer was placed securely in L4. It addresses itself to key issues relevant to the question, and sufficient knowledge is deployed to meet most of its demands. Some of the evaluation is only partly substantiated but the answer is generally well organised and communicated with clarity.

## Question 7

This was by far the more popular of the Section C questions for paper 38.1. Candidates who attempted it mostly knew something of the NEP, and the ways in which it did, or didn't enhance the status and condition of the peasantry. They tended to know more about a range of other developments that could be compared with the impact of the NEP, most notably Emancipation, the reforms of Stolypin and the Land Decree. Weaker answers tended to use a chronological approach which often didn't help evaluation of the question. Also, there was a tendency in some answers to lose focus when dealing with the latter part of the period in the question with regard to the actions of Stalin and Khrushchev for example, which were not strongly focused on attempts to improve the status and condition of the peasantry.

While the introduction of the NEP ~~to~~ by Lenin's early Communist government was certainly a significant ~~form~~ action that improved the status and condition of the peasantry ~~its~~ the short term nature of its impact and the political, non genuine desire that motivated it limits the extent it can be seen as ~~step~~ a significant attempt ~~at~~ ~~the~~ Russian peasant saw various attempts taken by leaders from 1855 - 1979 which had varying success and impact, from Alexander II's Emancipation Decree of 1861, to Stolypin's reforms and the concession of peasant plots under Stalin and later Communists. Yet the most significant action taken to improve the Russian peasantry can be seen as the reforms of Stolypin due to the direct, ~~and~~ genuine desire behind them.

The introduction of the NEP, New Economic Policy, by Lenin's Communist Government after the ~~economic~~ ~~collapse~~ <sup>economic</sup> downturn of War Communism had a significant and positive impact of the lives of Russian peasants in condition and status. The NEP removed the ban on private trade, ~~allowing peasants to~~ and allowed peasants to sell surplus grain for profit, allowing peasants to either set

up more prosperous homes or more for cities to set up small businesses. Not only did the NEP improve the peasants' economic condition, incentivising them to ~~to~~ sell for profit thus creating the economically prosperous kulak class, but also socially. The growth of produce, incentivised from the NEP, improved peasant diet and <sup>access</sup> for all Russians to fruit, meat and dairy and also social welfare <sup>consequently</sup> bringing electrification to many peasant homes. The desire of the government for peasant economic status to benefit from the NEP is shown by how Lenin stepped in, in the later Scissors crisis to ensure that <sup>grain</sup> prices did not ~~not~~ decrease too significantly.

However the significance of the NEP as an action taken to improve the status of the peasantry is limited by its motivations, which can be seen as political and not a genuine desire to improve peasant lives. Lenin introduced the NEP as an economic concession after the country had been ravaged by War Communism. War Communism had seen Russia's economic situation decline with peasants burning crops and killing livestock in protest of grain requisitioning and terror. ~~of the~~ Consequently Lenin's government ~~had~~ was threatened politically by loss of support, thus in order to secure political control of Russia and restore economic prosperity the NEP was necessary. Thus the NEP was not a ~~direct~~ action of the government aiming to directly improve the Russian peasantry but had political motivations, thus limiting its significance. This is reinforced by how the NEP only improved peasant lives for the short term, since by Lenin's death and Stalin's role collectivisation, terror, ~~and~~ stronger government control and

de-kulchisation was increased.

On the other hand the reforms of Stolypin in the ~~late~~ early 1900s can be seen as the most significant government action that improved the lives of the peasantry & condition and status, due to their genuine motivation of the reforms. Stolypin abolished redemption payments, which had kept peasants tied to the land and many under the same or worse poverty as they were as serfs due to the magnitude of the burden. Not only did the redemption payments ~~improve~~ improve peasant lives ~~but~~ his creation of the Peasant Land Bank further improved their economic condition, incentivising and giving many the opportunity to set up their own prosperous consolidated farms. Stolypin also removed peasant passports and weakened the hold of the mir over the peasantry, which had kept many from establishing economically prosperous lives by advocating medieval farming methods and allocating ineffective scattered strips of land. Consequently many peasants set up prosperous consolidated farms or even moved to Siberia, ~~and the~~ and the beginnings of the prosperous kulak class were created. While Stolypin did not fully break the grip of the mir over the peasantry, ~~it~~ since by WWI ~~the mir~~ the offer of stability from the mir assured that many still remained under its control, his attempt to break its grip over the peasantry was significant and a genuine attempt. While Stolypin also had aims to improve agricultural

production and industrialisation through his reforms, they were far more of a <sup>significant</sup> attempt to improve the lives of peasants than that of the Communists' NEP.

~~On the~~ ~~However~~ Alexander II's Emancipation Edict of 1861 can also be seen as a significant attempt to improve the lives of the peasantry, in comparison to the NEP. The Edict certainly improved the legal status of the peasantry, who were no longer serfs and could marry without consent of their lords. However the huge burden of redemption payments significantly hindered the extent the Edict was an action that improved peasant lives, the burden causing by the late 1880s 2 out of every 3 peasants of former serfs unable to feed their household without falling into debt. Thus while the decree improved peasant legal status on paper it did not improve their lives socially or economically as significantly as either the NEP or Stolypin's reforms. The Edict did not also have a genuine desire to improve peasant lives, with Alexander seeking to secure his position as an autocrat and modernise Russia through it, abolishing serfdom from the top rather than waiting for it to abolish itself from below.

Moreover the concession of peasant plots by Stalin and the social benefits given by later Communists Brezhnev and Khrushchev up to 1979, also showcase other significant actions which improved peasant lives. While the Concession of

peasant plots by Stalin in 1932, significantly improved peasant lives from the initial ~~poor~~ impoverishment of collectivisation by giving them a chance to supplement their diet and provide an income for themselves it was not as significant as either Stolypin's reforms or the NEP. The Concession was introduced as an action not genuinely motivated to improve peasant lives but to provide breathing space after the initial forced collectivisation and disastrous famine of 1931-32 which killed 80.5 million, ~~the same as the~~ ~~Stalin~~ and the concessions were short term and rolled back after WW2. ~~That~~ Berzhnev's ~~other~~ social reforms of giving state pensions and benefits and importing western grain to ensure the supply of cheap bread for the peasants, as well as workers, was also a significant action to improve peasant lives, alongside Khrushchev who reduced taxes on peasant plots. Yet the significance of the improvements on peasant lives these reforms had is not as great, in terms of an ~~significant~~ immediate and ~~the~~ magnitude of impact as Stolypin's Reforms or the NEP, since by the late 1970s 75% of collective workers and peasants remained below the poverty line and ~~while they may have had access to cheap bread and potatoes~~ <sup>poverty</sup> diet was severely limited and Khrushchev's amalgamation and expansion of the ~~kollektiv~~ kolkhozy kept peasants under state control and limited their autonomy.

In conclusion the NEP ~~it~~ was not the most

significant action taken by the Russian government to improve the status and condition of the peasantry from 1855-79. While the NEP's social and economic benefits for peasant lives establishes it as more significant ~~to~~ an action than the Emancipation Decree, the Concession of Peasant Plots or reforms of later Communists Brezhnev or Khrushchev ~~of~~ the political motivations that drove the action establish it as less significant than Stolypin's reforms. Stolypin's reforms not only economically and socially improved peasant lives, like the NEP but had a genuine motivation to do so, to create a prosperous peasant class, incentivised to help land industrialisation, ~~to~~ Consequently Stolypin's reforms were ~~more~~ the most significant action compared to the NEP to improve peasant lives, reinforced by the NEP's short term nature.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This answer sustains an analysis of the relationship between key factors relevant to the question throughout. It displays sufficient knowledge to meet the demands of the question, with a full chronological range. Valid criteria by which the question could be judged are established and applied and the argument is logical and coherent. It received a top L5 mark.

## Question 8

There were few attempts at this question and most were not strong. Some were able to analyse the reasons for food shortages in Russia during this period, and were able to link these to government policies, especially under the communists. Few knew in any depth other reasons for food shortages and were not able to make substantiated judgements as a consequence.

Historians have debated the extent of which food shortages in Russia from 1861-1979 were a failure of government agricultural policy. When exploring this topic, we must consider the following criteria: Russia's status in war, the economic disparity & the interests of the people. When considering these three factors, we understand that Russia's famines were not a direct result of poor agricultural legislation, but a consequence of poor policy relating to war, economy & errors of the administration.

Firstly, Russia was enduring its worst economic state during the period of WWI. Their continued unsuccessful involvement in the war effort. The consistent taxing of the population to fund the army drained Russia economically, rendering the populace in economic hardship. The provisional government, ruled by Kerensky, had insisted on Russia's involvement despite famine, vast casualties & desertions. Not directly the result of poor agricultural policy, the famine of

1917 is better regarded as a consequence of Russia's poor economy due to its war effort faced by Kerensky. This is shown when the Bolsheviks assume power, agreeing to peace with Germany to follow with the focus on NEP, repairing both economy & agriculture under Lenin.

Furthermore, Stalin's method of collectivisation inflicted famine among Russia. Stalin intended to achieve economic prosperity through collective farming, funding industrialisation. The selling of grain & produce had left little for the people, inflating prices & causing ~~consequently~~ ~~poor~~ famines. This directly contradicts Krushchev's ideology, in which famine was inconsistent through his impractical solutions. The Virgin Lands Campaign made use of unused lands in Siberia to encourage production, but this led to soil degeneration, ending a short-lived success. Krushchev's new attempt, Maise cultivation, facilitated the growth of livestock through ~~corn~~ corn. Also with little success due to climate, Krushchev's poor policies had been the

result of famine in Russia, alongside poor economy from the aftermath of Stalin's rule.

To conclude, under the provisional government in 1917, & Stalin in 1928, famine had been a consequence to war & the leader's ideology of industrialisation, despite collectivisation acting as a poor policy, similar to the struggles of Khrushchev, who was unable to cut back strong agricultural policy alongside economic disparity.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This answer ends making some attempt to identify key features relevant to the question though the knowledge it displays lacks range. It comes to a judgement but this is weakly substantiated. It was given a high L3 mark.

## Question 9

There were few answers to this question. Of these, most were weak and unable to evidence with any precision, attempts by Chinese governments to develop mining and manufacturing, or to make judgements with regard to their success.

It is accurate to say that the Chinese governments failed to develop mining and manufacturing. In the Qing dynasty, the government refused to modernise and develop their country further, believing that they had no need to since their way was working. It was only after they got sought western powers that they realised how far behind they were and the government still refused to develop, the western powers were the first people to try and modernise China and improve its manufacturing and capabilities. For example the French taught them how to make different weapons and despite the fact that the Chinese government did not want this, it was useful.

Shortly after the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century in 1905 Emperor Puyi introduced the 100 days of reform which did improve mining and manufacturing, this was China's first step in modernising itself and in the Self Strengthening movement there were advances in coal mining and infrastructure. I think that the ~~the~~ early Chinese governments from 1860-1900 were at fault for not developing China but people like Sun Yatzen who created the GMD helped to improve it later on, especially since he was not a Communist and mining and industrialisation would be the two main things that he'd want.

There are also other factors ~~to~~ to consider, ~~for~~ ~~example~~ such as ~~western~~ <sup>foreign</sup> powers. They were useful for spreading their ideas but they kept attacking, there were uprisings against them like the Boxer Rebellion in 1899 and it would be very difficult for them to

develop China when it is in chaos. Japan also hindered progress towards these reforms as they ~~tried~~ attempted a full scale invasion of China and took a lot of land from them.

At these points in time China could not focus on developing these key things as they had to fight off western 'aliens' and Japan throughout the time period.

Another factor could be China's economics. This is because China was not a big country with a high big economy. They had very little trading with people outside of China and to begin with ~~was~~ and so they most likely could not afford to do much. Once they began trading with other countries more, they earned a lot more and could put ~~those~~ that money into better mining capabilities or factories. Over time China does advance these two things as they trade more

and can more from it, so it is suitable to say that they can be linked.

Another reason for the failure to develop these two industries is the Chinese people. Not all Chinese citizens were open to change, especially if the ideas came from \*foreigners. They caused uprisings and issues that showed the government what they wanted, but it was only in the 20<sup>th</sup> century that they realized how crucial it was to advance and develop China as they could finally see the world around them and how countries like Japan had modernised and advanced into a better and longer standing country, but also more powerful than before.

Overall, I would say that it is somewhat accurate to say that the Chinese governments largely failed to develop mining and manufacturing, ~~but~~ ~~rather~~ because

they refused to do it during the years 1860-1900 but soon then they were constantly fighting or hostile with other countries and could not develop while at war, they also had to do it when the economy was good enough and stable enough for the government to invest in those two areas, which it would not be if they are getting into war all the time. I think that it was only the Qing dynasty that largely failed to develop them because they were too ignorant to see that China needed change.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

Here, the candidate attempts analysis of efforts made by Chinese governments to improve mining and manufacturing but the answer lacks range and some depth. As a consequence, its judgement is weakly substantiated. It received a low L3 score.

## Question 10

This was by far the most popular of the Section C questions for Paper 38.2, and was often done very well with many high Level 4 and Level 5 scores. It was clear that candidates had a sound understanding of Deng's role in promoting economic growth in the 1980s and 90s, and were able to judge his overall contribution alongside those, most commonly, of the Self-Strengtheners, TV Soong and Mao. Weaker answers were less sure in their grasp of the material, lacking precision or chronological range most frequently, but many still did reach high L3 and L4 marks.

~~I strongly agree with the statement~~ Deng Xiaoping was indeed, by far the most successful individual in the promotion of economic growth in China in the years 1860-1997. For an individual to have been successful in promoting economic growth, they must have achieved their economic goals, and their reforms must have directly led to economic growth. ~~Dr Zhou~~ Mao Tse Tung completely failed in his aims for economic growth, but Li Hongzhang and T.V. Soong both saw levels of success due to their reforms. However, no one was as successful as Deng in achieving ~~to~~ his economic aims as well as creating reforms which directly ~~was~~ promoted economic growth.

Li Hongzhang saw some level of success in his Self-Strengthening Movement (SSM) in promoting economic growth. The opening of Western-style schools such as the Tongwen Guan as well as new military schools like the Jiangnan ~~Arms~~ Arsenal and the Fuzhou Shipyard meant that for the first time, the Chinese were able to establish ~~was~~ connections with European ~~from~~ business, as well as develop the military, two key aims of the SSM. However, these were found to be limited, as the establishment of HSBC largely benefitted the European bankers running it rather than promoting economic growth in China.

Further, the Japan's humiliating defeat devastated China as it demonstrated that Li's CSM had failed to strengthen China's military ~~power~~ which led to an indemnity of \$130 million needing to ~~be~~ be paid, actually stifling economic growth.

\*\*

\* somewhat

T.V. Soong had ~~rather~~ more success. He created the Imperial Bank of China, which allowed for foreign lending and investments, working with the League of Nations to procure foreign funding of projects in China. Further, his reformation of the tax system allowed China's new government to have a large pool of finance for public spending, leading to greater prosperity and economic growth. However, ~~the~~ more than half of the government's budget was used for war, suggesting that T.V. Soong was in fact, not very successful in securing China's economy in a way that funds would be used effectively. Though he cracked down on gangs, massive corruption still prevailed, and ~~China~~ the Imperial Bank of China never succeeded in establishing itself as a ~~the~~ major Chinese bank, and investments still had \*limited impact on ~~the~~ the growth of the Chinese economy, as it was difficult to get funding for projects which were of high investment risk, which was most Chinese projects. As a result, T.V. Soong was only somewhat successful in ~~the~~ the promotion of economic growth.

\*\* This is different from Deng Xiaoping. Deng's move towards state market economy had a major impact on economic growth in China. Allowing peasants to move into cities and towns to work in factories led to massive economic growth and military development, with production advancing from simply grain to munitions and armed vehicles, signifying a massive economic growth, as the production of complex machinery as opposed to simple subsistence crops marked a shift from complete poverty and devastation, to massive economic growth and development, as evidenced by the 300 million people lifted out of poverty, ~~and 100 million peasants moving into towns and cities~~, marking the widespread economic growth not limited to a few upper class students like at the ~~Schools~~ schools established by Li Hongzhang. As a result, Deng Xiaoping was clearly more successful in promoting economic growth \*\* //

Deng's reforms also went far beyond T.V. Soong's and had more success. While T.V. Soong did reform Chinese banking, allowing for a Chinese-owned national bank independent from foreign powers, Deng harnessed these powers to create massive economic growth. By counting the UN and active participation in the Security Council as well as repairing China's relationship with the USA, Deng was able to secure massive amounts of finance from the

IMF and World Bank. Loans from the World Bank totalled over \$30 billion by 1997, a scale of finance far beyond anything ~~on~~ orchestrated by T.V. Song. And by investing this into key areas such as agriculture, education and transport, Deng was able to create yearly economic growth of 10%, with revenue even doubling in one year. This ~~lasting~~ unprecedented level of economic growth, lasting and establishing China as an economic superpower to this day demonstrates that Deng was the most significant individual in promoting economic growth from 1860-1997.

Mao ~~is~~ aimed for economic growth via his Five Year Plans and collectivisation. A peasant-led Soviet model was introduced by Mao to lead to collective ~~high~~ work and the development of heavy industry. Mao set quotas for peasants living communally, and introduced innovative backyard smelting to increase the production of heavy metals. Mao had lofty plans for China's economic growth, but the fundamental issue was that these methods were ineffective. Quotas were almost never met, and the economy shrunk, launching over 250 million people into poverty, failing to create economic growth. Further, Mao's policy of collectivisation ~~which~~ led to a famine killing over 40 million people. As a result, ~~is~~

is clear that his work towards economic growth was a complete and utter failure.

Deng's reforms, however, were incredibly successful in promoting economic growth. His creation of SEZs and TVEs attracted investors who poured billions into Chinese projects, and also allowed peasants to move out of towns for a better life. 100 million peasants were able to move into towns and cities marking huge economic growth, with China fully industrialised and a growing working and middle class from the peasantry. China became one of Europe and the USA's biggest trading partners making billions in exports by 1997. As a result, Deng's reforms taking China from a destitute land of poverty to one of the world's biggest traders with a mobilised workforce shows that he was the most successful at promoting economic growth.

Deng's economic genius led to his reforms achieving its aims of lifting China out of poverty. He ~~was~~ and created an unprecedented level of economic growth, demonstrating that he was most successful.



This answer was given a safe L5 mark. It sustains an analysis of the relationships between key features of the question and presents knowledge sufficient to respond fully to its demands. It comes to a substantiated judgement based upon valid criteria, though this lacks a little conviction, and is well organised, and logically developed.

## Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

### Section A

- Candidates should ensure that they deal with both enquiries
- Candidates should not simply paraphrase the content of the source; they should develop valid inferences with reference to the question, supported by material contained in the source
- Candidates should avoid generic evaluation, eg 'it was written for publication so it may be sensationalised to sell more copies'
- There is no requirement to argue that the source is better suited to one enquiry than the other; any comments made in relation to this will be rewarded according to how they fit with the three strands of the mark scheme.

### Sections B and C

- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Planning of essays will help candidates develop an analytical approach
- Candidates must be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, so that they can address questions with chronological precision
- Candidates should aim to range across the breadth of the chronology in Section C questions
- Subject-specific terminology should be used precisely and accurately.

## 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>

