



ASSESSMENT and  
QUALIFICATIONS  
ALLIANCE

# Mark scheme

# June 2003

---

## GCE

## History

### Alternative F

## Units 1, 4 and 6

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

---

**CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:****AS and A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners**

---

**A: INTRODUCTION**

The AQA's revised AS/A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specifications. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS and A2 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS/A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The revised specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the new specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for AS and A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives and across all the specifications offered by the Board.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B for AS and Section C for A2) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section D).

**B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS****Level 1:**

The answer is excessively generalised and undiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

**Exemplification/Guidance**

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and undiscriminating with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

**Level 2:*****Either***

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

***Or***

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

**Exemplification/Guidance**

*Either* responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant but outline only description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically

*Or* responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

**Level 3:**

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but limited grammatically.

**Level 4:**

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation.

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

**Level 5:**

As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

**C: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS**

The relationship between the Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1.1, 1.2 and 2 and the Levels of Response.

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in AO1.1, by writing a narrative or descriptive response, will restrict themselves to a maximum of 6 out of 20 marks by performing at Level 1. Those candidates going on to provide more explanation (AO1.2), supported by the relevant selection of material (AO1.1), will have access to approximately 6 more marks, performing at Level 2 and low Level 3, depending on how implicit or partial their judgements prove to be. Candidates providing explanation with evaluation and judgement, supported by the selection of appropriate information and exemplification, will clearly be operating in all 3 AOs (AO2, AO1.2 and AO1.1) and will therefore have access to the highest levels and the full range of 20 marks by performing in Levels 3, 4 and 5.

**Level 1:***Either*

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly narrative.

*Or*

Answer implies analysis but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such answers will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics: they

- will lack direction and any clear links to the analytical demands of the question
- will, therefore, offer a relevant but outline-only description in response to the question
- will be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

- lack any significant corroboration
- be generalised and poorly focused
- demonstrate limited appreciation of specific content
- be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

IT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THIS TYPE OF RESPONSE AND THOSE WHICH ARE SUCCINCT AND UNDEVELOPED BUT FOCUSED AND VALID (appropriate for Level 2 or above).

**Level 2:***Either*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but lack weight and balance.

*Or*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

- understanding of some but not all of the issues
- some direction and focus demonstrated largely through introductions or conclusions
- some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

- arguments which have some focus and relevance
- an awareness of the specific context
- some accurate but limited factual support
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

**Level 3:**

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

- the approach will be generally analytical but may include some narrative passages which will be limited and controlled
- analysis will be focused and substantiated, although a complete balance of treatment of issues is not to be expected at this level nor is full supporting material
- there will be a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed, not fully convincing or which may occasionally digress into narrative
- there will be relevant supporting material, although not necessarily comprehensive, which might include reference to interpretations
- effective use of language, appropriate historical terminology and coherence of style.

**Level 4:**

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

- sustained analysis, explicitly supported by relevant and accurate evidence
- little or no narrative, usually in the form of exemplification
- coverage of all the major issues, although there may not be balance of treatment
- an attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or summary
- effective skills of communication through the use of accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

**Level 5:**

As Level 4 but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Level 5 will be differentiated from Level 4 in that there will be:

- a consistently analytical approach
- consistent corroboration by reference to selected evidence
- a clear and consistent attempt to reach judgements
- some evidence of independence of thought, but not necessarily of originality
- a good conceptual understanding
- strong and effective communication skills, grammatically accurate and demonstrating coherence and clarity of thought.

**D: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL**

***These principles are applicable to both the Advanced Subsidiary examination and to the A level (A2) examination.***

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: “What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?”. Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates’ responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid “bunching” of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills:**  
generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
- well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid “double jeopardy”. Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification



**June 2003**

**Alternative F: Russia and the USSR, 1855-1991**

**AS Unit 1: Tsarist and Revolutionary Russia, 1855-1917**

**Question 1**

(a) Use **Source C** and your own knowledge.

Explain briefly the importance of “peace” in Russia in 1917. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

L1: Demonstrates basic understanding that peace was an important issue in 1917 Russia, because it was involved in a major war. **1**

L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue of peace in relation to both the source and the context of 1917 Russia, e.g. the despair caused by continuing involvement in the war; the food shortages in towns; the growing disillusionment with the regime following several defeats. **2-3**

(b) Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how Lenin’s attitude to the Soviets in Source B was different from the attitude of the SRs in Source A. (7 marks)

Whilst candidates are expected to deploy own knowledge in assessing the degree to which the sources differ/the utility of the source, such deployment may well be implicit and it would be inappropriate to penalise full effective answers which do not explicitly contain ‘own knowledge’. The effectiveness of the comparison/assessment of utility, will be greater where it is clear that the candidates are aware of the context; indeed, in assessing utility, this will be very significant. It would be inappropriate, however, to expect direct and specific reference to ‘pieces’ of factual content.

*Target: AO1.2, AO2*

L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context. There will be an awareness that the attitude towards the Soviet is different, but very little or no contextual knowledge will be brought to bear. **1-2**

L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to own knowledge of the context. The answer will recognise the differences in attitude towards the Soviet: the SRs see it as a valuable institution in which to participate, whilst Lenin sees it as worse than useless. Answers will probably use contextual knowledge to develop at least two reasons to explain the differences between the two attitudes. For example, in the early days of the Revolution there was still optimism that the PG could deliver real change and the Soviets would play an important part in government. In contrast, Lenin was writing at a time when the

Bolsheviks did not have a majority in the Soviet, and he saw the Bolsheviks as being the only party committed to further revolution, and wished to disassociate them from other parties and organisations. Also, he was writing in the aftermath of the July Days when the Bolsheviks were under threat.. **3-5**

- L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge of the issue, and draws conclusions. The points made in L2 will be developed and there will be a clear explanation of the reasons for the difference in attitude between the SRs and Lenin. A top band answer may well make a substantiated judgement on the role of the Soviets, especially the Petrograd Soviet, and why groups like the Bolsheviks and SRs were very concerned about its role- due to the history of the Soviet going back to the 1905 Revolution and an awareness of the fact that it was seen by its grass roots supporters as the truly representative voice of the people at a time of important political change in Russia. **6-7**

- (c) Use **Sources A, B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

Explain the importance of the weaknesses of the Provisional Government, in relation to other factors, in bringing about the successful Bolshevik Revolution of October/November 1917. *(15 marks)*

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO3*

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations, which could apply to almost any time/and or place, based on either own knowledge or the sources. **1-4**

- L2: ***Either***  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.

***Or***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on description, but will have valid links.

***Or***

Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant will lack both range and depth and contain some assertion. **5-8**

- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from source *and* own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. **9-11**

- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

- L5: As L4 but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

## Indicative content

Answers should show awareness of some of the weaknesses of the PG: its lack of authority; its failure to end the war; its failure to call the Constituent Assembly; its failure to deliver on “bread and land”; divisions within itself; the rivalry of the soviets; problems such as the Kornilov Revolt. There should also be an awareness of other factors such as the role of Lenin and Trotsky, who between them made the Bolsheviks a force capable of stepping in to fill an increasing power vacuum. Clearly the PG was in a very difficult position once the initial post-revolutionary euphoria had worn off. This by itself did not ensure a Bolshevik takeover. Once the PG’s authority began to weaken, various scenarios were possible, including a right-wing takeover, probably some kind of military dictatorship. The reality was that the Bolsheviks, under Lenin and Trotsky, were more organised and determined than other groups in taking advantage of the fluid political situation which existed by the autumn.

Level 1 answers will be based on unsupported statements about what happened in the October/November Revolution. Level 2 answers will be mainly descriptive, but will contain a limited explanation of why the Revolution was successful for the Bolsheviks. Level 3 answers will address some of the weaknesses of the PG and other factors, but may be unbalanced, dealing with largely the PG or the other, or being thin in detail. Level 4 answers will be more substantial analyses, and make links between the PG and other factors. Level 5 answers will go beyond this in the depth of detail, linkage or analytical grasp, and will comment on which were the most important factors in bringing about change in October/November.

## Question 2

- (a) What was meant by “autocracy” in the context of late nineteenth century Russia?  
(3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term or concept, largely based on the extract. There will probably be a generalised definition of autocracy, not specifically related to the tsarist regime at this time. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term or concept, linked to the context. Answers may well recognise that tsarist autocracy implied a belief in divine right; and an acceptance that in the Russian tradition, strong government was essential to hold the empire together, untrammelled by limitations such as a parliament. **2-3**

- (b) Explain the reasons for the growth of revolutionary movements in Russia between the mid 1860s and the accession of Nicholas II in 1894.  
(7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue or event through general and unsupported statements. There will be a basic awareness that there were movements for change and/or a basic understanding of why they were “revolutionary”. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue or event through relevant and appropriately selected material. There will probably be some knowledge of what some of the groups and movements consisted, and what their policies were. For example, there were Populists, “Going to the People”, Land and Liberty, early Marxists and individuals like Herzen. There will be some understanding of why these groups wanted further change: the fact that the limited reforms passed before 1866 did not go far enough, and the fact that there was a period of reaction after 1866 under Alexander II and III. **3-5**

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors identified in L2, and makes explicit links between the nature of the regime and its policies and the activities of the opposition groups outlined above. **6-7**

(c) “The Tsarist regime, despite opposition to its policies, was never in serious danger of being overthrown during the reigns of Alexander II and Alexander III.” Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. *(15 marks)*

*Target: AO1, AO2*

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.

***Or***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**

L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance. **9-11**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

L5: As L4 but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. If no awareness of Alexander III’s reign is shown, answer should not score above bottom of Level 4. **14-15**

### **Indicative content**

There were many individuals and groups opposed to the regimes of Alexander II and III, for various reasons. The key question is the significance of these groups. Populist groups, active during this period, found it difficult to interest the peasants, who resented the attempts of

students and other idealists descending on their villages to preach the virtues of peasant socialism and the like. The Marxists groups which became active from the 1890s were small in number and influence. Their views had little popular appeal, they disputed amongst themselves, and found it difficult in any case to operate in a police state which lacked civil liberties such as a free press and freedom of assembly. There was a broader division amongst the “opposition” as a whole, for example between “westerners” who took inspiration from the west, and “Slavophiles” who believed that Russia’s salvation lay in its own people. The spectrum of opposition ranged from basically loyal liberals to committed revolutionaries. The autocracy had the machinery of repression such as secret police and censorship to hand, and also could count on great reserves of loyalty to tsardom from the masses. Clearly the opposition had “victories” – witness the assassination of Alexander II. However, there was never any serious indication (before 1905) that there was a real danger of overthrow of the entire regime – there was not the weight or unanimity of real opposition as opposed to dissatisfaction with particular aspects of Russian life. Also the regime did show the ability to adapt, albeit slowly: for example it developed an industrial base, without ever seriously modifying its autocratic nature.

### Question 3

- (a) What is meant by “tide of revolution” in the context of Russia in the early years of the twentieth century? (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term or concept, largely based on the extract. There will be basic recognition of the fact that there was a revolution in 1905. 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the fact that there was a Revolution in 1905, or at least a series of events such as the Potemkin mutiny and Bloody Sunday, which threatened the survival of the regime.. 2-3

- (b) Explain why the Tsarist regime was able to survive the 1905 Revolution. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue or event through general and unsupported statements. The answer will recognise that the regime did survive the Revolution, but gives a very generalised explanation. e.g. because the opposition was not united. 1-2
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue or event through relevant and appropriately selected material. The answer will develop at least two factors such as the concessions made in the October Manifesto; the divisions between liberals and radicals; and the maintenance of military discipline. The reasons may be either short-term, long-term, or a combination of both: for example, the implementation of Stolypin’s agrarian reforms coupled with repression. 3-5

- L3: As Level 2, demonstrating explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue or event and prioritises, making links or draws conclusions about their relative significance. For example, was the promise of reform the key factor in enabling the tsar to ride out the storm, since it split moderates from more committed activists for change? **6-7**
- (c) “The Tsarist regime, despite the threat to its existence in 1905, was stronger in 1914 than it had been ten years before.” Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. *(15 marks)*
- Target: AO1, AO2*
- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisation which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4 but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

### **Indicative content**

The tsarist regime was still in existence in 1914. Some historians believe it was stronger than ever, having recovered from the 1905 Revolution and governed through a mixture of repression and concession. There were fewer overt disturbances in 1914, although there was an increasing number of strikes described as “political”. There had been particular flash points such as the Lena Goldfield strike, but how representative had that been? The Tsar still retained loyalty, and he had quashed the radical demands of the first dumas and had secured a more compliant duma. There had been reforms, notably Stolypin’s efforts to encourage land ownership by a loyal peasantry. However, relatively few peasants had taken advantage of the opportunities, despite their grievances over land ownership – and Stolypin had been assassinated in 1911. It was not until the disasters inflicted by Russia’s involvement in the First World War that real disillusionment with Tsardom set in.

**June 2003**

**Alternative F: Russia and the USSR, 1855-1991**

**A2 Unit 4: Russia and the USSR, 1881-1985**

**Question 1**

- (a) Explain what was meant by “collective, socialised farming” in the period 1928-1933.  
(5 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Basic definition with limited exemplification. There will be undeveloped understanding that collectivised or socialised farming meant something different from the norm of individual landholding. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the concept with supporting detail drawn either from the source and/or own knowledge, that during this period, collective or socialised farming meant a system of agriculture whereby individual landholding was rapidly replaced by a collectivised system in which the majority of land was organised into large collective farms, with peasants working cooperatively. Answer may include aims and results of collectivisation at a basic, undeveloped level. **2-3**
- L3: As Level 2, with developed references to both the source and own knowledge. For example, there may be an emphasis, as in the Source, on the collective nature of the transition to a new way of farming and the fact that “landlords” and “kulaks” were disappearing- with small and middle peasants supposedly the beneficiaries. There may be details on the organisation of collectives or some indication of Stalin’s motivation and an awareness of the rate of change – the fact that much of the USSR was collectivised by 1933. The movement for change was driven from above, by the Party. **4-5**

- (b) How useful are **Sources C** and **D** in explaining why agricultural reform continued to be a priority of Soviet Governments in the post-Stalinist period? (10 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Answers should use both sources for higher marks in each mark band.

- L1: Identifies/extracts simple statements from the sources which demonstrate awareness that agricultural reform was necessary – because both sources give clear indications that farming was a “problem” area.. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates explicit understanding of the uses of the sources, combined with own knowledge, in demonstrating the problems of agriculture in this period.. However, the answer may see “usefulness” as being almost entirely based on descriptive information, in other words “value by content”. **3-5**

- L3: Draws conclusions about utility/sufficiency in relation to the problems experienced by agriculture and the Government's responses to them. Source C shows that the production of grain was erratic from year to year. The Source is useful in giving an overview, although one might also question the accuracy/reliability of the Source, e.g. how were these statistics gathered? Are they accurate? Source D indicates that 20 years later agriculture was still a problem: growth had declined. There was a lack of machinery, antiquated methods, too much bureaucratisation etc. Is the usefulness of the Source affected by the fact that it is from *Pravda*, an official Party organ and therefore hardly objective – or does this simply highlight the fact that agriculture was a major problem? Own knowledge could include many factors, for example the need to recover from the devastation of war after 1945; the perennial problem of getting peasants more concerned with their private plots to work hard on collectives; the low status of the rural economy; the difficulties encountered by Khrushchev in attempting to reform agriculture e.g. the Virgin Lands scheme. **6-8**
- L4: Uses material selected appropriately from both source and own knowledge to reach a sustained judgement on utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue of problems in agriculture and the implied or explicit need for reform. C supports D in that the figures do not indicate all the other social and economic problems associated with the rural economy, problems which are partially addressed in Source D. The rural economy was always seen as the poor relation of urban society, which is why young people in particular preferred to work in towns rather than the countryside. . **9-10**
- (c) Assess the validity of the judgement that, in the period 1881-1985, “Tsarist and Soviet Governments were continually held back by their inability to secure lasting agricultural improvement.” *(15 marks)*
- Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*
- L1: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, either from appropriate sources or from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***  
 Demonstrates by relevant selection of material *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance.
- Or***  
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **5-8**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **12-13**



L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with a selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **14-15**

### Indicative content

The focus of the question is on long-term continuity. Agricultural improvement remained a perennial problem for Russian and Soviet Governments throughout this period for economic, political and social reasons. There were many issues: the poor quality of much of the land; poor yields compared with many developed countries; inefficient farming; conservative attitudes; poor communications; the difficulty of feeding an expanding population and of supporting industrialisation; problems caused by recovery from devastating wars. Answers may legitimately focus on the “agricultural” aspect and/or treat the question in a broader context e.g. considering the political implications also such as Stalin’s desire as part of collectivisation to secure Communist control of the countryside and so “bring the peasants into line”. Higher level answers should cover all or most of the period, giving attention to a range of issues; the problems of low production and food shortages in the period before 1900; Stolypin’s reforms and their impact; problems of production and distribution during the First World War; the impact of World War 2; Khrushchev’s (partially successful) attempts to improve agriculture and the rural economy, continued under Brezhnev. Answers with this breadth of coverage should also, at this level, contain sustained judgement. However, there cannot be an expectation that all material is given equally detailed treatment for the whole period, although there should be a good overall grasp of perspective for a high level answer.

## Section B

### Question 2 onward

These questions are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidates should be clearly linked to the range of factors or issues covered in the question as indicated by the generic A2 level of response mark scheme and by the indicative content in each specific mark scheme for each question.

#### Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources)

L1: ***Either***

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative.

***Or***

Answers implies analysis, but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such responses will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply almost to any time and/or place. **1-6**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

**Or**

Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, implicit understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **7-11**

L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

**Question 2**

Assess the impact of the “Stalin Revolution” upon the political and economic state of the USSR by 1941. **(20 marks)**

*Target: AO1, AO2*

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (without reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-6   L2: 7-11   L3: 12-15   L4: 16-18   L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

L1 answers will be assertions or a narrative of the process/effects of industrialisation and/or collectivisation and/or Stalin’s political consolidation. L2 will be mainly descriptive or with some analysis, but covering only certain aspects e.g. the development of heavy industry; the fact that the rural areas of the USSR were now mainly collectivised; the fact that along with the economic transformation, Stalin had established a relatively monolithic autocracy reinforced by terror and propaganda. However, answers will lack weight, balance or judgement. L3 answers will contain a range of material, covering both economic and political aspects, but the judgement of the impact of economic and political change will be implicit or partial. L4 answers will include a good range of material, covering different aspects such as capital goods, consumer goods, the defence industry, and similarities and differences between the first three five-year plans; the impact on agriculture – the fact that the rural economy, although not efficient, did recover from the trauma of collectivisation and the regime did manage to feed the towns; and the fact that in political terms, the USSR was run as a totalitarian state in which Stalin dominated the Party, and the Party dominated the country, with everything subordinated to the perceived needs of the regime. Answers will probably consider the impact on ordinary Russians. The best answers may show good perspective and may discuss interpretations and issues such as: was the impact of the revolution “successful”? – for Stalin, the country, ordinary people?

**Question 3**

To what extent, by the time of Stalin's death in 1953, had the Soviet economy and society recovered from the effects of the Second World War? (20 marks)

*Target: AO1 and AO2*

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (without reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

L1 answers will probably describe events in the USSR between 1945 and 1953, but with no analysis. L2 answers may consider some of the analytical demands of the question e.g. considering the impact of the Fourth Five Year Plan, but the range of analysis will be limited. L3 answers will consider a range of issues: the economy, but also political and social factors such as the extent to which Stalinism was still dominant, with political and cultural issues also important. Reference may well be made to the factors such as the reimposition of collective farms following the disruption of war: and the renewal of the purges, although on a smaller scale than in the 1930s. The rapid industrial recovery will be analysed, perhaps with an indication of its causes – the hard work of the people themselves, and the reparations extracted from defeated enemies, notably Germany. Judgements may be only implicit or partial, whereas the judgement will be explicit in L4 answers, which will also deal with “To what extent”, probably containing therefore also a summary of how the USSR had been affected during the War. The best answers will be very analytical and sustained in argument and give substantiated treatment to both economic and social developments, although not necessarily to the same depth.

**Question 4**

Khrushchev and Brezhnev believed that the ‘Stalinist system’ could be made more effective without fundamentally changing it.” To what extent had they achieved this aim by 1968? (20 marks)

*Target: AO1 and AO2*

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (without reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

L1 answers will be generalised and may contain simple descriptive accounts of some of Khrushchev's and Brezhnev's policies. L2 answers will contain limited analysis but will lack much weight or balance. L3 answers will cover a range of issues, but judgement will be implicit or partial. Material

will include some of Khrushchev's reforms of the party, industry, agriculture, destalinisation, and the far more limited reforms of the Brezhnev period. The analysis of the Khrushchev period will probably refer to the attack on Stalin's excesses and the partial rehabilitation of victims; the new incentives to peasants and the Virgin Lands scheme; the new emphasis upon consumer goods; the partial decentralisation of the administration; the attempts to reform the bureaucracy. L4 answers will contain explicit analysis, and probably in particular a clear analysis of what Stalinism actually consisted of. The best answers will have a sustained judgement, probably showing perspective when considering the extent to which politically, economically, socially and culturally the USSR remained "Stalinist".

**June 2003****Alternative F: Russia and the USSR, 1855-1991****A2 Unit 6: The End of the Soviet Union c1968-1991****Question 1**

- (a) Use **Source C** and your own knowledge.

How valid is Andropov's interpretation of the problems facing the USSR in the early 1980s?  
(10 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract and the interpretation it contains. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the interpretation and relates to own knowledge. **3-5**
- L3: As L2, and evaluation of the interpretation is partial. **6-8**
- L4: Understands and evaluates the interpretation with reference to own knowledge to reach a sustained and well supported judgement on its validity. **9-10**

**Indicative content**

A Level 1 answer may be very generalised or one which summarises the content of the Source: the references to “selfish” individuals and the implication that there are economic problems. Level 2 demonstrates understanding of the implication that there were economic problems and internal opposition in the USSR during this period, but not clearly addressing the concept of validity. Level 3 focuses explicitly on “validity”. The answer will show an appreciation of economic realities at this time: the fact that Andropov was correct in his assessment of some of the economic problems, particularly overmanning and low productivity in the labour force. Own knowledge should lead candidates into brief references to other aspects of the economy: for example the failure to address long-standing problems of the Stalinist command economy such as an emphasis upon meeting targets at the expense of quality, lack of real incentives, poor productivity in many sectors, insufficient production of consumer goods. There are also implied problems in that clearly, as Andropov recognises, there were critics voicing disquiet. Higher-scoring answers will distinguish between the types of criticism e.g. “critics” or reformers who wanted changes to the political and/or economic system. Inevitably most criticism had to be muted in such an authoritarian society, and in any case most critics accepted the fundamentals of the system. But there were some hardened individuals opposed to the system itself, including the monopoly of power by the Communist Party. “Opposition” to reform could include academic supporters of more economic flexibility; supporters of the Hungarian system; individual dissenters such as Medvedev, Sinyavsky, Solzhenitsyn, Sakharov, Orlov; groups such as the Helsinki Groups; nationalist opposition in the Republics; groups such as Jews seeking to emigrate. Exhaustive detail would not be expected for answers at this level, but there should be a sound

appreciation of the context of Andropov's declaration and some assessment of his claim of "selfishness" and what was meant by "violations of socialist law". Level 4 as Level 3, but shows a developed and reasoned awareness both of the real problems facing the USSR and the context and validity of Andropov's claims as outlined above.

(b) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.

How reliable is Source A as evidence of reactions to the Soviet regime's policies?

(10 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract in relation to the issue presented in the question. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates some appreciation either of the strengths and/or of the limitations of the content of the source in relation to its utility/reliability within the context of the issue. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates reasoned understanding of the strengths and limitations of the source in the context of the issue and draws conclusions about its utility/reliability. **6-8**
- L4: Evaluates the utility/reliability of the source in relation to the issue in the question to reach a sustained and well supported judgement. **9-10**

### **Indicative content**

Level 1 summarises the content of Source A with its report on opposition groups within the USSR, but not explicitly tackling "reliability"; or making very generalised statement about reliability. Level 2 answers demonstrate some understanding of the source in terms of its reliability, e.g. uses some own knowledge to assess the fact that there was opposition within the USSR, partly a hangover from the Khrushchev period and partly from dissatisfaction with the "system". The answers may tend towards a simplistic interpretation of reliability by equating it with truthfulness, and not considering the context of the Source. Level 3 demonstrates reasoned understanding of the reliability of the Source by clearly establishing "Reliability for what?" The context of the Source will be considered: does the fact that it is a secret report written by the "people in the know", the KGB, for its political masters, mean that it is likely to be well-informed and accurate, or is the report still distorted by propaganda for fixed assumptions? Would Andropov be deliberately exaggerating the threat of opposition? Where would the KGB have got its information? Level 4 is as Level 3, but analysing "reliability" in a very reasoned and wide-ranging way, with clear evidence of own knowledge directed towards the question. There may be some overlap here with part (a): answers might demonstrate developed knowledge of the "opposition" (see the Level 3 descriptor for part (a)), and then discuss to what extent this represented an organised opposition, or rather particular grievances of certain individuals or groups.

- (c) Use **Sources A, B, C and D** and your own knowledge.

Consider the view that “the USSR after the accession of Brezhnev to power remained a totalitarian, inefficient state, reluctant to carry out meaningful reforms.”

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-6**
- L2: ***Either***  
 Demonstrates by relevant selection of material *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance.
- Or***  
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with a selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

### **Indicative content**

Level 1 answers will probably just summarise some of the information in the Sources concerning the nature of Developed Socialism and its supposed successes or failures. Level 2 answers will summarise the sources effectively, or show some accurate knowledge of the nature of the Soviet State after Brezhnev’s accession to power, but with limited range and detail. Level 3 answers will combine some accurate knowledge with the sources. Level 4 answers will not only extract information from the sources effectively but show a good range of knowledge of the period: the nature of the totalitarian state under Brezhnev and afterwards (or indeed a discussion of the concept of “totalitarianism” as applied to the USSR), along with an assessment of its “inefficiency” particularly in the economic sphere (less so in other areas such as political control?), and whether any effective reforms were carried out. Level 5 answers will do this whilst sustaining an effective argument throughout.

The fundamentals of the Stalinist system remained under Brezhnev. The USSR remained authoritarian, buttressed by the apparatus of a police state and extensive propaganda putting across one inclusive world view of socialism, which, it was assumed, was subscribed to by all reasonable citizens. There were no longer general purges, and those who conformed were no longer in fear of arbitrary arrest. But any group or individual which appeared to go against the norm, such as Jews wishing to emigrate, or those who supported the European movement for human rights, were liable to harassment or arrest. Whilst not totally ruthless or efficient, this still represented a totalitarian state which tried to manipulate people's minds as well as their activities. The economy was inefficient: the Stalinist command economy which had hauled the USSR up by the bootstraps in the 1930s by centralised planning and directives was no longer capable of meeting the more sophisticated needs of a later generation. But its principal features were still in place: Khrushchev's reforms had not worked, and Brezhnev's approach was deliberately cautious: there was tinkering with the system, but no fundamental economic or political change, although there were some improvements in social services. Agriculture remained inefficient. In these senses, there were no meaningful reforms since the USSR was still an authoritarian society dominated by a Party with a very conservative ethos reluctant to change. Clearly under Gorbachev in the late 1980s there were serious attempts at reform, and glasnost meant an end to totalitarianism. However, many problems, including inefficiency, remained.