

GCE 2004
June Series



Mark Scheme

History Alternative F Units 1, 4 and 6 *(5041/6041)*

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from:

Publications Department, Aldon House, 39, Heald Grove, Rusholme, Manchester, M14 4NA
Tel: 0161 953 1170

or

download from the AQA website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester, M15 6EX.

Dr. Michael Cresswell Director General

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 indiscriminating 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 indiscriminating 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 AO 1.1, 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 (AO 1.2), 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 (AO 2, 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 characteristic: 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 the 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.

Alternative F: Russia and the USSR, 1855-1991**AS Unit 1: Tsarist and Revolutionary Russia, 1855-1917****Question 1**

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

Explain briefly the significance of “the Duma” in the context of Russia after 1905.

(3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. that the Duma was a parliament. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. that the Duma was promised certain political powers such as approving proposed legislation – but after it was created its powers were restricted and it was manipulated by the Government to become more compliant. It provided a very limited form of representative government. **2-3**

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

Explain how **Source B** challenges the Tsar’s claims of reform in **Source A**. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

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 and 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.

- L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context, e.g. basic recognition of the fact that in Source A the Tsar promises reform, whereas in Source B there is an assertion that in reality nothing has changed. **1-2**
- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge, e.g. showing a clear understanding that the Tsar in Source A was responding to the 1905 disturbances by promising major reforms, implying constitutional government, whereas Source B comes from a revolutionary source, from an organisation crushed by the Tsar, and the source is therefore complaining that the so-called reforms have done nothing to change the autocracy. **3-5**

L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions. In addition to extracting information from both sources as in Level 2, additionally explicitly applies own knowledge to explain the differences. The Tsar in 1905 has clearly been shaken by events and has been advised to offer reforms in order to save the regime and possibly to split the opposition. Source B highlights the fact that the opposition was not united and had disparate aims. Some critics of the regime wanted reform but not revolution and welcomed the concessions. However, the authors of Source B were revolutionaries who were not going to be satisfied with the promised constitutional reforms which left tsarism intact, and in any case were feeling the brunt of the regime's counter attack and were in fact arrested – as far as they were concerned showing the hollowness of the tsar's promises. The answer is likely to contain a good balance between the use of sources and own knowledge. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of repression, in relation to other factors, in enabling the tsarist regime to retain power in the years 1905 to 1914. **(15 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, 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, based *either* on 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 descriptions, but will have valid links.

Or

Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from 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 the sources *and* from 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* from own knowledge, 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 and partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

Answers should show awareness of the range and extent of factors responsible for the survival of the regime between 1905 and 1914. Repression should clearly figure prominently in the answer. Stolypin's measures to crush elements of opposition and to punish participants in the 1905 disturbances involved in particular the summary courts martials in the countryside. More immediate measures in 1905-06 included the arrest of the leaders of the St Petersburg Soviet and the continuing exile of known revolutionaries. Although there were some relaxations, e.g. on trade union activity, many repressive measures remained in force, including censorship. There were periodic "incidents" such as the Lena Goldfields massacre, the continuing activity of the secret police, and the Government's manipulation of the electoral system and treatment of the dumas to remind us that this was an autocracy with some features of a police state, in which overt opposition was difficult. However, "other factors" should be addressed. Answers are likely to include reference to the immediate success of measures such as the October Manifesto in splitting the opposition; later reforms (in particular Stolypin's land reforms), factors such as the weakness and divisions of revolutionary groups, the well of loyalty that still existed for the regime despite frustration at some of its activities, and possibly even a discussion of how stable the regime actually was. There is also likely to be a discussion of the activities of the dumas. Answers may conclude that there was no one particular factor keeping the regime in power, but several factors at work, some relating to actions of the regime itself, some relating to factors beyond its control.

Level 1 answers will be based on unsupported generalisations. Level 2 answers may provide more detail but will still tend toward a descriptive approach of things which happened without much explicit explanation. Level 3 answers will discuss some of the factors mentioned above, but may well not be very balanced, focusing too narrowly on certain aspects. Level 4 answers will include a good range of relevant material, with a balanced explanation of why the regime survived and balancing the impact of repression with other factors. Level 5 answers will additionally be characterised by a sustained level of analysis throughout and a judgement that is clearly substantiated.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by "Tsar Liberator" in the context of Alexander II's reign in the 1860s. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. the fact that Alexander was associated with reform or that he freed the serfs. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the fact that the tsar carried out several reforms in the 1860s in response to Russia's defeat in 1856 and his recognition of the need for changes if his regime and Russia were to flourish. The phrase is usually associated with the freeing of the serfs in 1861, and this may be developed, although reference may also be made to other judicial, military, educational and local government reforms. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Alexander II introduced reforms in Russia in the 1860s. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. there will be basic recognition that Alexander did carry out reforms inside Russia, with generalised statements or factual lists, but with no specific knowledge of what prompted these reforms. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material. There will be an explanation either generally why there were reforms in this period, or what the motivation was for specific reforms to do with the context of Russia's development at this time and Alexander II's own particular predilections, such as his supposed liberal tendencies. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance. Longer term factors are that reform, particularly of serfdom, had long been an issue, because it was seen as inefficient and a bar to further reform. The need for reform had been highlighted by Russia's poor performance in the Crimean War. Answers may well refer to Alexander's own "liberal" inclinations, but also emphasise his determination to maintain the autocracy. Knowledge will be shown of some of the motives for specific reforms: military reforms because the army was clearly not up to scratch; because serfdom had gone, there was a need for judicial and local government reform, because landowners had lost the powers of local government and justice they once held over the serfs. Other reforms were designed to modernise Russia as befitting a "great power". However, there was also the argument that the reforms were designed to make the autocracy more efficient – certainly the effect was to reduce the power of the nobility and to increase the power of the professional bureaucracy. **6-7**

- (c) "Despite Alexander II's reforms, by the time of Alexander III's death in 1894, the Russian people were still desperate for change."

Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, 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, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**

- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant 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 and 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

Alexander II's reforms were clearly important, but they did not solve Russia's long term problems. The emancipation of the serfs was a major economic and social development, but it did not satisfy many people. The nobility was dissatisfied with the loss of its traditional right, the ex-serfs were dissatisfied with the terms of emancipation. Problems of poor yields, agricultural backwardness and grinding poverty continued, made worse by the increased pressure on land from a growing population. Some reforms were more effective: for example the relaxation of discipline and the shorter enlistment period in the army. There were legal reforms but although civil trials became fairer, political offences could still be dealt with arbitrarily. Educational reforms affected the universities, but the reforms were later qualified. The creation of *zemstvos* was a step towards better local government, but only a limited step. Alexander's reforming zeal was stopped in the mid 1860s by the Polish revolt and attempts on his life, although he never completely lost the will for change, and was considering further reform at the time of his assassination. But nothing was done to alter the basis of the autocracy. Even less was done under Alexander III: influenced by advisers like Pobedonostev, the Tsar, whilst not reversing all reforms, did clamp down on some, and measures like the introduction of land captains reinforced controls.

However, whilst there was a lot of dissatisfaction from all groups in society, from discontented ex-serfs burdened with debt, from nobles feeling let down or suffering economic difficulties themselves, or from middle classes feeling excluded from power, this did not mean that all were "desperate" for change. When student radicals joined the populist movement and went into the countryside, they were met by peasant indifference or hostility. More organised radical groups like the marxists had limited support. Other groups like the anarchists had limited appeal. There is no evidence of a widespread movement of opposition to the regime, which of course was also bolstered by coercive powers as well as benefiting from the authority coming from the weight of tradition and the church. There was no major threat until 1905.

A Level 1 answer will be very generalised and indiscriminating, being very thin on factual material or making unsubstantiated assertion in response to the question. A Level 2 answer will make some relevant selection of material, showing some understanding that Alexander's reforms left many, including ex-serfs and nobles, dissatisfied, and that in any case reforms then dried up, whilst Alexander III's reign was marked mainly by repression. The answer is

likely to be descriptive, with some links to the question. A Level 3 answer will include the range of material of a Level 2 answer, but the selection or commentary will show a link between the expectations of people and the reality following the policies of Alexander II and III. There is likely to be reference to different groups such as peasants, nobles, radical groups such as Populists, with an indication of why reforms were ineffectual or opposed. The answer may lack weight or balance. Level 4 answers will demonstrate a wide range of well selected material, and explicit understanding of the question, and a balanced explanation of how the links between the expectations of Russians in this period and how they actually reacted to the policies of the two tsars. Level 5 answers will additionally contain sustained analysis and substantiated judgement throughout; and may also show a good perspective, challenging, for example, the assumption that Alexander II was a considerable reformer, or that Alexander III's reign saw nothing but reaction; as well as considered judgement on the degree to which Russians as a whole were "desperate for change".

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by "to share authority" in the context of Russia after the February/March Revolution. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. the concept of sharing authority in the context of "dual power" between Soviet and Provisional Government after the Revolution. 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the fact that after the February/March Revolution there were two sources of authority in Russia, the elected Soviet and the unelected Government, and the fact that there was an uneasy compromise between the two, with the Soviet for example claiming the right to approve of certain policies in return for its support. 2-3

- (b) Explain why the Provisional Government decided to keep Russia in the First World War. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. there will be basic understanding that the choice was made by the Government to continue fighting in the War, but relying on generalised and largely unsupported assertions. 1-2

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the fact that the Government felt obliged to continue its commitment to the Allies in return for desperately needed war credits, and a desire e.g. by Kerensky, to achieve a victory which would give authority to an unelected regime. **3-5**

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance. As for Level 2, a mark at the top of the band will probably make good links between the reasons for the Government's decision. **6-7**

(c) "The Provisional Government failed because it did not have the skill or determination to govern Russia effectively after the collapse of tsarism early in 1917." Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. *(15 marks)*

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, 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, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**

L3: Demonstrates, by relevant 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 and 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 Provisional Government faced many problems after the February/March Revolution once the initial euphoria following the fall of tsarism had worn off. The Government was not elected and had no inherent authority. It faced a rival in the Soviet. It continued the war, and continuing defeats meant that all the problems caused by the war also continued. The promised elections were put off; and although there were some reforms, key ones like the redistribution of land were also avoided. As the difficulties mounted and a power vacuum was created, and as the Government failed to maintain authority, the way was open for a determined opposition group to take the initiative, which is what the Bolsheviks under Lenin did. Whether the Government lacked the necessary skill is debateable. There were talented individuals: Kerensky was charismatic, but lacked authority, and crucially, the success which might have brought him the necessary respect. Other talented individuals like Milykov were compromised by political dealings within the Government. It might be argued that whereas the Government survived the July crisis, it did not handle the Kornilov Revolt well, but it was in a difficult situation. Determination was either lacking or was not sufficient alone to save a Government which had its hands tied by an unsuccessful war.

A Level 1 answer will be very generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than unsubstantiated assertion that the Provisional Government lacked the qualities to survive. A Level 2 answer will demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, some of the actions and policies of the Provisional Government, such as its policies towards the war, political opposition, land reform, and the impact of the Kornilov Revolt, but the answer is likely to be descriptive with only implicit links to the question of why it actually failed. A Level 3 answer will demonstrate selection of appropriate material as suggested for Level 2, but also show more explicit understanding of why the Government actually failed, possibly considering the contribution of other factors such as the activities of the Bolsheviks under Lenin as well as the actions of the Provisional Government. However, the answer may lack weight or balance. Level 4 answers will demonstrate, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question, probably with a balanced explanation of the extent to which lack of skill or determination was a major factor in the failure of the Government, and the extent to which other factors such as the role of opposition were crucial. There will be a clear understanding of the role of the “power vacuum”: the fact that the Government faced competition from the soviet, that it lacked many figures of authority, that there were divisions of opinion within it, etc. Level 5 answers will have sustained analysis and substantiated judgement throughout; and may additionally show a good perspective in examining the extent to which the Provisional Government was the architect of its own downfall.

Alternative F: Russia and the USSR, 1855-1991**A2 Unit 4: Russia and the USSR, 1881-1985****Question 1**

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

Explain what is meant by “Witte’s industrialisation strategy” in the context of Russia’s economic development before 1905. (5 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Basic definition with limited exemplification, e.g. Witte in the 1880s introduced a strategy for industrialising Russia with both political and economic motives. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the concept with supporting detail drawn either from the source and/or from own knowledge, e.g. Witte’s strategy, which he regarded as necessary to develop Russia’s economy and help Russia maintain and develop its Great Power status, involved state-sponsored activities such as railway building and attracting foreign investment into Russia. As Source A implies, the Russian economy was backward in some key aspects such as technology and communications; it also points to the fact that the strategy involved Russia becoming a large debtor nation, and its implementation had several ups and downs before 1914. **2-3**
- L3: As L2, with developed reference to both the source and own knowledge, e.g. the answer will show clear understanding of the nature of Witte’s strategy, involving as it did various strands such as railway building, high tariffs on imports, exporting grain to raise money, and the borrowing of foreign capital. **4-5**

- (b) Use **Sources C and D** and your own knowledge.

How useful are these sources in explaining progress in the Soviet economy in the Stalinist period and after? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Identifies/extracts simple statements from the sources which demonstrate agreement/disagreement on the issue. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates explicit understanding of utility/sufficiency etc. with reference to the sources and knowledge of the issue. **3-5**
- L3: Draws conclusions about utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue, with reference to both sources and to own knowledge. **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. **9-10**

Indicative content

The obvious question to ask of Source C is how accurate the figures are and from whence did they originate. Answers which simply take the sources at face value are unlikely to get above a low Level 2 at most. Candidates may use own knowledge to comment on the sources' approximate accuracy. They do give a fairly realistic picture of industrial achievement, but only in certain sectors. There are no figures, for example, of machine tools. They are also raw production figures and tell us nothing about labour input, productivity, quality, and the uses to which these materials were put. It is difficult to extrapolate from these figures the changing emphasis on defence in the later 1930s, and the fact that later plans built upon the superstructure created by the First Plan. Therefore the figures give just a broad overview of some of the achievements of the first three plans.

An important difference with Source D is that it was written much later, and the author has the advantage of looking back with perspective on the achievements of the industrial economy. There are very few figures, but the tone is clear: it is a pessimistic picture. Own knowledge should confirm that the picture created was basically correct: it is a frank admission of the problems, and does not contain the propaganda or rhetoric of many Soviet pronouncements – candidates may relate this to the fact that Andropov did have a reputation as an economic reformer, a forerunner of Gorbachev. Whatever their views on the utility of each source individually, answers should show an awareness that the sources come from very different periods, one from the beginning of the planned economy, and one towards the end when all the defects of the planning were becoming more and more evident.

Level 1 answers will make a simple statement that the Soviet economy did or did not make progress, but there is unlikely to be any real evidence of own knowledge or relevant use of the source material to substantiate an argument: for example the answer might simply repeat some of the statistics from Source C, taking the source at face value. Level 2 answers will go a stage further in making use of both sources to illustrate the point about progress or lack of it. For example there will be some comment on the production figures in Source C and the rather sombre assessment of progress in Source D. There is unlikely to be any comparison between the sources, and there will probably still be little attempt to consider the provenance or context of the sources. Once answers move beyond taking the sources at face value or relying on “value by content”, they may well move into Level 3. These are answers which clearly do not confuse utility with reliability, and demonstrate enough own knowledge as well as textual analysis in considering the specifics of the sources – from where did the statistics come, what do they include and what do they leave out? How does Source D compare to the propaganda and false optimism which so often characterised Soviet economic pronouncements? A Level 4 answer will do this particularly well, analysing both sources and also showing a good grasp of contextual knowledge – for example showing how Source D amplifies what is known about Andropov's reform agenda. A Level 4 answer will certainly be well-substantiated and not full of assertion.

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

To what extent did tsarist and Soviet governments improve industrial performance in the period 1881-1985? (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, 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 the 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

This is a synoptic question and candidates' responses should be rewarded for referring to aspects of change and continuity over a period of at least 100 years, as detailed in the specification for this particular Alternative, and to an appropriate range of factors as exemplified by the indicative content for each particular question.

The focus of the question is on long-term continuity. Russian and Soviet governments worked hard to improve industrial performance from the late 1880s onwards. Witte's policies were significant in the 1880s: for example, sponsoring railway building and attracting foreign finance. The degree of success is debateable: industrial production certainly expanded in some areas, from a low base, although there were periods of boom and slump before 1914 and although production certainly grew rapidly from a low base, Russia actually slipped down the European industrial rankings. Russia remained an agricultural economy. War and Civil War disrupted industrial progress, exacerbated by the trauma of War Communism. There was a gradual change under NEP, but Stalin's industrial drive from 1928 was the key event. The emphasis on central planning, targets and massive injections of capital into producing producers' goods certainly produced results in terms of quantity, if not quality, and the industrial base established was a significant factor in the Soviet victory in World War Two. The war devastated industry, although there was a remarkable recovery by 1953. However, long-term stagnation began to set in. Khrushchev's industrial reforms failed, and from the 1960s there was a reluctance to change. Although favoured areas such as defence were given priority, the Stalinist command economy proved incapable of meeting the needs of a more mature industrial society. Consumer industries remained backward, the economy was labour intensive and growth rates seriously declined. By the time of Gorbachev coming to power in 1985, the industrial economy was virtually in terminal decline.

Level 1 answers will make assertions or use material from the sources with no real explanation, for example stating that the pessimistic tone of Source D suggests that the regime failed to improve industrial performance. Level 2 answers may or may not use material both from the sources and own knowledge – the key point will be that whilst recognising that there was industrial progress of sorts in this period, the level of argument, while relevant, will not be very sophisticated. For example, the answer may not show awareness that whilst there were significant industrial developments, it was not a continuous process. Level 3 answers will certainly use both material from the sources and own knowledge, and do so in a reasonably balanced way. For example, there may be a recognition that industrial performance under War Communism and NEP was very different. There may be a recognition of the fact that although there were massive increases in production in the 1930s, "more" did not always mean "better" in terms of the quality of goods. But Level 3 answers will lack the balance, depth or sustained analysis of the higher levels. Answers in Levels 4 and 5 will clearly address the issues of "To what extent" and "improve" and cover the whole period or a significant part of it. For Level 5 in particular the judgement and analysis of evidence will be sustained throughout or for a substantial part of the answer.

Section B

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

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

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: ***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 responses will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost 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

To what extent did the Stalinist purges of the 1930s damage the USSR politically and economically by 1941? (20 marks)

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

The purges, in their broadest sense, did a lot of damage to the USSR. Collectivisation and the campaign against the kulaks damaged agriculture and the confidence of the peasants. Millions of people were killed or imprisoned, and in an atmosphere of fear, initiative was discouraged, which had political and economic consequences. On the other hand, did the climate of fear strengthen the USSR by strengthening Stalin's control, and did the siege mentality created help the USSR survive World War Two? Did the rigid Stalinist mentality enable the targets of the Plans to be met sufficiently to strengthen the economy in a relatively short space of time?

Level 1 answers will probably describe some of the events of the purges but with little analysis in terms of the question. Level 2 answers will be mainly descriptive or with some analysis, but covering only certain aspects, including some of the following: the campaign against the kulaks; the development of the gulag system; slave labour and industrialisation; the show trials; the activities of the secret police; the role of propaganda. Level 3 answers will include a reasonable amount of this material, but the answers will lack weight or balance and judgement on the extent of "damage" may be implicit or partial. Level 4 answers will include a good range of material, and explicit judgement. Issues debated might include whether the climate of fear created was harmful politically, or did it strengthen the USSR by increasing Stalin's control, and did the siege mentality created help the USSR survive World War Two? Or did demoralisation inhibit not just social interaction but harm the economy e.g. by discouraging initiative? Level 5 answers may well go further in discussing interpretations and show a good perspective of the period, and judgements will be sustained.

Question 3

“Despite the devastation it caused, the experience of the 1941-1945 war actually strengthened the USSR.” How far was this true by Stalin’s death in 1953?

(20 marks)

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

The war was devastating in its human, economic and social impact on the USSR. Millions of soldiers and civilians died. The economy was disrupted, despite the Soviet success in building weapons. Whole communities were uprooted, partly through Stalin’s attempts to deport “suspect” nationalities. On the other hand, Stalin’s power was even stronger as a result of the Soviet victory than before, and the USSR was now a major player in world diplomacy, despite the fact that the priority in the post-war years was to restore the Soviet economy and reaffirm Communist control which in some respects had been loosened during the war years. The economy did recover, albeit as the result of huge efforts and sacrifices enforced on the population under the five year plans. The economy eventually began to slow down and even begin to stagnate, but this was due less to the war than to the fact that the Stalinist planned economy had several crucial flaws, which became more obvious and serious as time went on.

Level 1 answers will probably describe the devastation or the events of the war but contain no analysis. Level 2 answers might consider some of the ways in which the USSR was affected by war, but the range of analysis will be limited. Level 3 answers will consider several issues: the impact of the war on strengthening Stalin’s reputation and hold on the country; the long-term boost to the economy once initial damage had been rectified; the fact that Russia emerged from the war as a superpower and the arbiter of central and eastern Europe. Short-term factors such as the damage done to Russia by the German invasion were overcome. Level 4 answers will include a range of material and an explicit judgement. Level 5 answers will be analytical and sustained in argument, considering several issues and making a substantiated judgement, with a particular focus on the degree of recovery by 1953.

Question 4

To what extent had Khrushchev's policy of destalinisation achieved its political and economic objectives by 1968? (20 marks)

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

Khrushchev's motives were to create a climate for reform and remove the excesses of Stalinism which stifled pupils' lives. Destalinisation included an attack on Stalin's reputation; changes in personnel; the restrictions on the police; economic reforms aimed at decentralisation and more initiative and accountability; reform of the Party; and improvement in the standard of living. The degree of success was limited. Economically, the fundamentals of the Stalinist command economy remained, with all its faults and inflexibility. The various agricultural and industrial reforms failed to make much impact, partly due to entrenched bureaucracy and obstructionism. However, more consumer goods were produced, and it might be argued that many citizens benefited to a limited sense from this and better social services. The degree of political reform was limited. Attempts to make the Party less bureaucratic and more accountable were largely defeated by bureaucrats who felt their privileged positions under attack. Again, the fundamentals of the system remained in place, but it had never been Khrushchev's intention to destroy them. Severe political problems were caused by disturbances particularly in Hungary. At least Khrushchev had checked some of the arbitrary features of Stalinist rule. However, following his failures and removal from office, his successors were more cautious. Brezhnev emerged as the next leader, and made conservatism and orthodoxy the key watchwords: Khrushchev-style experiments were ruled out, and the USSR began to descend into a period of economic and political stagnation which was eventually to lead the collapse of the USSR.

Level 1 answers will be generalised and descriptive in their outline of what Khrushchev actually did. Level 2 answers will contain some analysis, but will still be descriptive in approach, whilst aware of some aspects of destalinisation. Level 3 answers will be more wide-ranging, although they will lack overall weight or balance. They will include reference to the motives – to create a climate for reform and remove the excesses of Stalinism which stifled peoples lives – and they will outline some of the policies such as the attack on Stalin's reputation; the changes in personnel; the restrictions on the police; economic reforms aimed at decentralisation and more initiative and accountability; attempts to reform the Party; attempts to improve the standard of living. Level 4 answers will include a good range of material and will explicitly analyse the extent to which Khrushchev's policies did actually change the USSR. Level 5 answers will have sustained judgement and closely analyse the link between the objectives and the success, and possibly show perspective in having an overview of Khrushchev's achievements.

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

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

How valid is the interpretation given in **Source A** of the events which provoked the Soviet coup of August 1991? Explain your answer. *(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 and relates to own knowledge to reach a sustained and well supported judgement on its validity. **9-10**

Indicative content

Level 1 answers will be generalised or summarise the content of the source. Level 2 answers will show some understanding of the context of the source in addressing the issue of reliability, e.g. examining the truth of the allegations. There is clearly some truth in them: for example there had been several examples of conflict between national groups. Answers may well query the extent to which other developments preceding the coup represented a profound crisis or threatened citizens' security. Clearly there is likely to be some comment specifically about the subjective nature of the source, issued as it was by the conspirators, and it would be legitimate to examine their possible motives. Level 3 answers will probably additionally focus on both authenticity of the claims in the source and the issue of "reliable for what." Clearly the source is subjective: however, background knowledge should confirm that the views expressed were the views of many Russians, particularly Party members, disturbed by previous events such as Gorbachev's criticism of events after the 1917 Revolution, the introduction of multi-candidate elections in 1987, the decline in Party membership, the new presidency established in 1990, anti-Soviet activity in the Baltic Republics, Azerbaijan, Georgia etc. the debates about the Union Treaty and Yeltsin's election to the Russian presidency. Level 4 answers will make a well substantiated evaluation of the validity of the interpretation given in the source, examining the context of the coup and the motives of those who carried it out.

- (b) Use **Source B** and your own knowledge.

How useful is **Source B** as evidence about the reasons for the failure of the coup?
(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 answers will summarise the content of the source but not explicitly address the uses or limitations of the source as evidence. Level 2 answers may well take the source at face value rather than examine it in a meaningful context. Answers which confuse reliability with utility are likely to be in this Level. Level 3 answers may well demonstrate a reasoned understanding of the uses and the limitations of the source as evidence for the failure of the coup, using own knowledge to back up judgements. There are likely to be comments about the subjective nature of Yeltsin's interpretation; however, there should also be a reasoned discussion of the content and nature of the source. The source has an immediacy which is useful, although that also raises questions about its perspective. Some of the assertions are true: the limitations on the power of the Party; the events surrounding the Union Treaty. There are likely to be comments also about the nature of the language, which is clearly subjective. Some of Yeltsin's appeals bore fruit, for example most troops did not support the coup. Level 4 answers will analyse both uses and limitations in depth and in context, with clear evidence of own knowledge leading to a balanced and reasoned answer.

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

“The surprise was not that the coup of 1991 occurred, but that it collapsed so quickly.” Assess the validity of this judgement. (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, 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. **1-6**
- 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 the 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 simply summarise the information in the sources, without explicitly addressing the question or applying any own knowledge. Level 2 answers will summarise the sources effectively, testing their assertions against some own knowledge in a limited range or detail; or may show limited knowledge of prior events and not use the sources. Level 3 answers will combine some accurate knowledge with the sources. The knowledge will probably relate to factors such as the growing evidence of nationalist discontent in republics such as Georgia and the Baltic States, and the economic stagnation which Gorbachev had tried to address with limited success. Factors relating to the coup are likely to include the lack of co-ordinated planning or vision by the plotters, and the lack of support for them in army units in Moscow. Level 4 answers will extract some information from the sources, but also discuss in more sustained depth the events of the previous twenty years or so in order to establish the truth of the assertion in the question. Answers are likely to focus upon economic problems, the introduction of *glasnost* and *perestroika* and the

uncertainties they produced; the political reforms of Gorbachev and the opposition they provoked; nationalist discontent and threat to the Union. Some clues about the collapse of the coup are given in source C, but candidates should also use their own knowledge to develop the points made about the changing nature of political authority since 1985 in particular. Level 5 answers will be as Level 4, but sustain an effective argument throughout, with a substantiated judgement.