



General Certificate of Education

History 5041/6041

Alternative F Russia and the USSR, 1855–1991

Mark Scheme

2005 examination – June series

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.

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.

June 2005

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 importance of “preparing for a Constituent Assembly” in the context of events in Russia between the two Revolutions of 1917. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. recognising that the Assembly was a kind of parliament but showing little or no awareness of context relating to events after the February/March Revolution. **1**

L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. recognises the fact that the Provisional Government was unelected and therefore an important plank of its “liberal” programme following the Revolution was a promise to provide for a democratically elected assembly. It remained a key issue: the fact that preparations for elections were postponed because of the uncertainties and difficulties which Russia faced was symptomatic of the precarious situation in which the Government found itself, and in which it steadily lost support and then credibility. **2-3**

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

Explain how **Source A** differs from **Source B** in the attitudes expressed towards the Provisional Government. (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. Source A expresses support for the Provisional Government, albeit conditional, whereas Source B is totally opposed to the Government. **1-2**

L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge, e.g. explains that the SRs like all political groups in the aftermath of the February/March Revolution, was prepared to support the Provisional Government as heralding a new post-tsarist dawn. The SRs were enthusiastic because they assumed that there would be significant reforms such as those mentioned in the source, e.g. individual freedoms, and also others such as land reform which were major planks of their own programme. In contrast, Lenin in Source B is totally opposed to the Government for two reasons: according to his version of Marxist theory, the February Revolution was only the first stage of a two-part revolution, and as such had left the middle classes rather than the proletariat in control; and secondly, as a revolutionary Marxist he had no faith in the Government's policies, which included the setting up of a parliamentary Government which he considered as offering nothing to the working class, and support for a War to which he was totally opposed. **3-5**

L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. develops the answer using the provenance of the sources and their timing. Source A was written soon after the Revolution when there was general euphoria and all parties on the spot, including the Bolsheviks, were prepared to offer at least conditional support to the Government, because someone had to take control in Russia and there was the promise of widespread reform. Source B was not typical of attitudes even in April: Lenin's anti-government stance was not even the official Bolshevik stance at the time, and Lenin had to fight to establish the views here as the Party line. But the SRs themselves became split, with the Left SRs following the Bolshevik line. Therefore the differences were not just those of content, but attitudes were also determined by timing. **6-7**

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

Explain why the first Russian Revolution of 1917 was followed by a second only eight months later. *(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

From the sources it is possible to establish some reasons for the relative proximity of the two revolutions. Source A implies the uncertainty of the political situation with its reference to “the danger of counter-revolution”. There is also the stated warning that support for the Government might be withdrawn. Source B flatly states opposition to the Government and a determination to overthrow it. Source C outlines several reasons for the failure of the Provisional Government: failure to command military support; political and economic incompetence; inability to stand up against determined opposition; the fact that it was only intended to be temporary and was unrepresentative.

From own knowledge there are several points which could be developed. For example, from the start the Government faced competition from the elected Petrograd Soviet which offered only conditional support. By continuing the war the Government eventually became discredited by continued military defeats and was unable to solve problems such as inflation caused by the war. The Government felt unable to carry out some of its promised reforms such as land reform, and elections to the new Assembly were postponed. Although surviving the July Days, the growing weakness of the Government was highlighted by the Kornilov affair. The Government lacked credibility and support. In the resulting power vacuum, a ruthless party with determined leadership, such as the Bolsheviks possessed, was able to mount a coup which, whilst lacking mass support, was capable of overturning an ineffectual Government.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to focus on some basic narrative of events between the two revolutions. At Level 2 there will be a greater range and selectivity of evidence and description will be more supported. Level 3 responses will have greater accuracy, range and depth and make some links, e.g. between the weaknesses of the Provisional Government and the ways in which the Bolsheviks were able to exploit these, although the links may not be sustained. At Level 4 the quality of the argument will be stronger and there will be a clear understanding of the complexity of the reasons for the second Revolution occurring so soon after the first, relating to a range of factors, for example the structure of the Government, the War, the fluidity of the political situation, the role of individuals like Kerensky and Lenin. Level 5 responses will recognise the complexity of the different factors, will probably cross-reference sources and own knowledge effectively, and will draw conclusions about the nature of the 1917 Revolutions.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “dabbling in freedom” in the context of tsarist policy in the early 1860s. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. recognition that the tsarist regime of Alexander II carried out some reform in the 1860s. 1

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. recognition that Alexander carried out some reforms in the 1860s. There may be brief reference to emancipation and possibly some other measures such as military, legal, educational and local government reform. Answers at the top of the level are likely to recognise the “dabbling” aspect, i.e. the reforms were important but did not actually offer real “freedom” to a society which was still governed autocratically. 2-3

- (b) Explain why there was dissatisfaction with the reforms carried out during Alexander II’s reign. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. that the freed serfs were unhappy with the terms of the 1861 emancipation or that Alexander II abandoned his policy of reform in the mid 1860s. 1-2

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. explaining why the reforms did not appease all sections of Russian society. Peasants resented the redemption payments they had to pay after emancipation and increasingly suffered from land hunger and continued poverty, whilst the nobility resented the loss of their labour. The educational reforms partly liberalised the universities but did not significantly affect education for the mass of the population. The zemstvo reforms were significant for local government but did not give national political representation. The legal reforms were significant but did not cover “political” offences. Conservatives were suspicious of reform, but radicals were not satisfied with the scope of change – particularly as the reforms dried up following the Polish Revolt and attempts on the Tsar’s life. 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, e.g. examines the significance of emancipation, the most significant of the reforms, and explains clearly why, although this was deemed necessary, it did not please many Russians, but also failed to solve the basic problems of agricultural poverty and inefficiency. There will be a clear recognition that although individual reforms were important they did not radically alter the nature of tsarist society or politics and simply encouraged radical groups to continue their opposition, whether like the Populists trying to convince peasants, or whether directly plotting against the tsar himself. 6-7

- (c) “Between the accession of Alexander II in 1855 and the start of the 1905 Revolution, the tsarist regime proved very effective in resisting pressure 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

The reforms of Alexander II were significant but did not fundamentally alter the basis of the economy or society, and certainly had a negligible impact on the political system. Particularly from the mid 1860s onwards, the reforms largely, although not completely, dried up. Alexander III set his mind against reform, and Nicholas II before 1905 also showed no inclination to any change which might threaten the basis of the autocracy. In view of this, there were elements in Russia wanting further change. These elements ranged from liberals wanting constitutional change on western lines, to some nobles and middle-class professionals wanting a greater say in the political process, to Populists in favour of a form of “peasant socialism”, to anarchists, terrorists, and by 1905 more organised groups such as the Social Democrats and SRs. Clearly opposition could not be discounted: Alexander II was assassinated in 1881 and there were further attempts on the tsars’ lives. There were other pressures, for example, created by pressure on land and periodic famines which stimulated peasant discontent. Credit pressure of economic/financial change e.g. Witte. However, the regime was quite effective in resisting change. In addition to counting on widespread reserves of traditional loyalty, the regime employed a range of methods such as censorship and the secret police to reinforce its authority. Many of the most revolutionary leaders found themselves in exile. Consequently prior to the major scare of the 1905 Revolution, the regime did successfully resist major change.

Level 1 answers will probably be generalised and provide a few descriptive examples of opposition of the Government response. Level 2 answers will be mostly descriptive of events and there will be little attempt to address the concept of “effectiveness”. Level 3 answers should address the degree of effectiveness, and there will be some material on opposition and the Government response, although the range might be limited. At Level 4 the analysis of opposition and response will be reasonably balanced and broad. Level 5 answers will additionally draw conclusions soundly based on the detailed evidence provided.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “dividing the liberals from the socialists” in the context of the October Manifesto of 1905. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. a bald statement that the October Manifesto promised reform. **1**

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. a recognition that the Manifesto was an attempt by the regime to defuse the 1905 disturbances, specifically by offering a cocktail of limited constitutional reform and granting of individual rights, designed to satisfy moderates and liberals, although unlikely to satisfy socialists who were seeking a radical transformation of society which would involve the destruction of tsarism. The strategy succeeded in that the regime survived, at least in the short term. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why the setting up of the dumas did not end dissatisfaction with the tsarist regime. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. describing the setting up of the dumas but not examining their development or the regime’s response. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. this is likely to include the motives behind the setting up of the dumas, their constitution and limited powers, particularly in light of the Fundamental Laws, and their subsequent development. The SRs boycotted the First Duma. The manipulation of the dumas, including the changes in the electoral system for the third and fourth, disappointed constitutionalists. The second chamber with its power of veto meant that the duma did not have legislative power. The tsar’s dismissal of the First Duma led to the Vyborg Manifesto by frustrated members, including the Kadets. The Second Duma was also dismissed after a short time after criticising the Government. Right-wing parties dominated the Third Duma of 1907-12; the Fourth Duma of 1912 was reasonably compliant, but even moderate deputies despaired of real change, although they did continue to criticise government policy. Radical groups like the Bolsheviks were totally dismissive of the system, but even constitutional reformers could not be happy with

the system of government and saw little opportunity for real change. Therefore dissatisfaction continued, whether overtly expressed or not. **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, e.g. developing some of the points in L2. **6-7**

(c) “The death of Stolypin in 1911 was a fatal blow to the prospects of Nicholas II’s regime achieving successful reform and stability.”
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

Answers are likely to focus first of all on Stolypin’s policies between 1906 and 1911, a combination of repression against those involved in revolution and subversion and moderate reform, particularly agricultural reform designed to create a loyal class of landowning peasants. At the same time he manipulated the Dumas, helping to ensure that they were reasonably compliant. Although not popular, Stolypin was an able minister, whereas there were few competent successors. Stability seemed less assured following his assassination: for example, there was the Lena Goldfields massacre and a growth in strikes. Serious reform was not on the agenda. However, it is possible to exaggerate the significance of Stolypin: for example, his land reforms were relatively limited in their impact. The issue of whether stability was assured after 1911 is difficult one; the Tsar still retained considerable loyalty

and there were signs of economic progress despite some evidence of discontent. The outbreak of war completely changed the situation. It can, of course, be argued that the regime was not committed to the sort of reforms which would have satisfied its opponents and therefore the death of Stolypin was not a significant factor in this respect.

Level 1 answers will make brief, undeveloped statements about events between 1906 and 1911. Level 2 answers will be mostly descriptive of events and are unlikely to really address the issues of successful reform and stability. Level 3 answers may well link events to the issue of stability, but are likely to be limited in range. At Level 4 there will be a reasonably broad analysis of how Stolypin's policies, and subsequent events, link to the issue of Government success and stability. At Level 5 the judgement made will be more extensive and sustained, with a clear link between issues of reform and stability.

June 2005

Alternative F: Russia and the USSR, 1855-1991

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

Question 1

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

How useful are **Sources B** and **C** in explaining the motives behind Soviet economic policy in the years 1918 to 1941? (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

Source B shows a big increase in industrial production, while Source C shows Stalin's wish for the USSR to be seen as "advanced". It might be deduced from the figures in Source B that the fall in industrial production after 1913 and only gradual recovery provided a motive for the drastic Five Year Plan programme. On the other hand there is not a clear indication of motive and the provenance might be queried: where do the figures come from and are they accurate? Own knowledge should enable candidates to discuss the strategy behind industrial and agricultural policy: the need to rectify the disasters of War Communism; dissatisfaction with the ideology of NEP and a desire to industrialise as the basis of a socialist society; a perceived need to compensate for Russia's isolation by creating a strong industrial base; a desire to implement "socialism in one country" etc. Of course the sources themselves cover only part of the period.

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

"Despite frequent changes of policy, Russian and Soviet governments were spectacularly unsuccessful in securing sustained economic progress in the years 1881 to 1985."

Assess the validity of this statement.

(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 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

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.

Candidates are being asked to evaluate economic progress over a long period. Therefore they should survey both industrial and agricultural factors, although not necessarily to the same depth. Source A is more about Witte's motives and the nature of his industrialisation strategy than the results, although there are also clear indications that key areas such as agriculture and light industry were neglected, and the strategy put a heavy reliance on foreign capital. Source B, if accurate, certainly gives a clear overall indication that both industrial and economic advance went backwards between 1913 and 1927 in the case of industry, and 1913 and 1924 in the case of agriculture. Source C implies that prior to the time of the article, Russia had been backward economically, but the article itself is triumphalist, claiming that both the industrial and agricultural strategies recently adopted have been spectacularly successful. In contrast, Source D talks of continuing problems: unwieldy management of industry; declining living standards; mistaken agricultural policies. Since this is an internal high-ranking Party document rather than public propaganda, it is likely to have validity, and does suggest poorly sustained economic progress over a long period.

Own knowledge should amplify many of these points and add others. Before 1914 agricultural progress was limited. The improvement of agriculture had a low priority before

1906, and then Stolypin's reforms had only a limited impact. Under Witte and later to 1914, there was some rapid industrial progress, with Russia starting from a low base, but progress was uneven and was heavily dependent on foreign investment. WW1 and the subsequent Civil War had devastating effects on both agriculture and industry. There was a recovery under NEP, although it was faster in agriculture, as Source B indicates. Stalin's economic revolution had a profound impact. Collectivisation was certainly not a success in terms of increasing production, although it did secure food supplies for the towns. Industrialisation was a success in terms of sheer output and making the USSR effectively stronger for war, although the command economy was also in many ways inefficient and an unwieldy instrument for securing later industrial progress once the industrial base had been established. WW2 set the USSR economy back a long way, although war production was safeguarded and played a vital role in the Soviet victory. There was never any sustained economic progress after the war. Despite periods of agricultural reform, especially under Khrushchev, agriculture remained relatively unproductive and the poor relation of the economy. By 1955 the USSR did manage to recover industrially from war, but the economy gradually stagnated, with falling growth rates as the planned economy proved unresponsive to real needs, whilst various attempts at reform failed and priority was given to certain key areas such as defence. By 1985 the whole economy was in a serious state of decline.

At Level 1 answers will probably be based on unsupported generalisations and assertions, or based on basic description. Level 2 answers will probably also be predominantly descriptive and very unbalanced in their coverage of the 100 year period. At Level 3 there should be some focus on continuity, some (although not necessarily equal) coverage of both agriculture and industry, and some meaningful attempt to tackle the precise question. However, the answer may well lack overall balance and depth. At Level 4 there should be fuller treatment of the whole period, with good coverage of both agriculture and industry. Level 5 answers will contain a developed and sustained judgement, with a good level of supporting evidence and possibly showing a good perspective, for example by linking industry and agriculture.

Section B

Question 2 onward

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

Examine the relative importance of political and economic motives behind Stalin's Great Terror of the 1930s. **(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

Stalin's Terror probably had several motives, although there is a debate about the extent to which it was carefully planned or controlled – there are arguments that it largely developed its own momentum and was pushed along as much by zealous local officials as by Stalin himself. These arguments can certainly be credited if argued and supported. Various other motives have been suggested: that Stalin was basically vindictive and suffered from paranoia about his own position, apparently added to by Kirov's popularity; he wished to get rid of old Bolsheviks, who had once been rivals for the leadership in the 1920s; he wished to assert total control over the Party and prevent any more arguments over policy; he wanted to abolish what he saw as Trotskyist influence; it was an integral part of his economic revolution – by creating an atmosphere of uncertainty and fear than maximum effort could be extracted from the workforce (including the vast convict empire); socially, by not allowing

anyone to feel safe, the Terror atomised society and created an atmosphere in which individuals felt isolated and powerless to organise or oppose, whilst propaganda built up Stalin as the heroic leader protecting loyal Soviet citizens. Purges were also a way of creating scapegoats when there were mistakes in the workplace or the regime demanded a change in policy. Action against the kulaks can here be accepted as part of the Terror.

At Level 1 and Level 2 answers are likely to be dominated by general assertions or basic descriptions of the Terror with limited evidence or evaluation. At Level 3 and above, answers should be reasonably wide ranging, considering at least some of the possible motives for the Terror, although the evaluation will not give equal weight to all of them. At Level 4 there should be some clear evaluation, and the answer should be reasonably wide ranging on the various causes. Level 5 answers will probably show an impressive depth of evidence and a substantiated judgment.

Question 3

Assess the economic and social costs to the Soviet people of the Great Patriotic War of 1941 to 1945, in the years to 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 costs of the war to the USSR were enormous, and this question encompasses both the war years and the post-war years under Stalin, although it is not essential to give equal treatment to both. Large areas of the USSR were occupied by the Germans. This led to the destruction of huge areas of land, both agricultural and industrial. Although the USSR had situated many factories in the East, nevertheless thousands of villages, towns, enterprises, farms, railways etc were destroyed. In addition, millions of soldiers and civilians were killed. Although the USSR was able to produce massively, inevitably the emphasis was on war production. About 25% of industry was destroyed. Between 1945 and 1953 industry recovered under the Fourth Five Year Plan to actually exceed pre-war levels in some areas, including coal and steel. However, this was at the expense of other areas, including light industry and consumer goods. Reparations from Germany and Eastern Europe filled the gap only partially. Attempts to revive agriculture were less successful. Collectivisation was reimposed in once-occupied areas, but there were shortages of labour and material, private plots were disbanded, there were serious shortages. Socially these years were devastating for the Soviet people, despite any ties of patriotism stimulated during the war. The Terror continued into the war, and ruthless treatment by the Germans added to the misery. Large national minorities suspected as potential collaborators were uprooted.

There was the trauma of huge military and civilian losses. After the War some Russians hoped for a new era, for example building on the Western alliance, but the USSR became as closed to outside influences as before, as Stalin restricted links with the West and reimposed his Terror. Many Russians, especially in rural areas, had little incentive to work, as 70% of produce was allocated to the State, and rural inhabitants were even denied rations. Other major social costs included the shortage of males caused by the war.

Level 1 and Level 2 answers are likely to be dominated by unsubstantiated assertions or basic description, with little or no evaluation. To reach Level 3 or above, answers should include material on both economic and social factors, although not necessarily to the same extent, and there should be some evaluation of the costs. A Level 4 answer should be reasonably wide-ranging and produce enough evidence to substantiate an evaluation. At Level 5 there should be a good range of evidence and the evaluation should be well-substantiated, possibly also with a good sense of perspective.

Question 4

To what extent was Khrushchev successful in his political and economic reforms?
(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

Politically Khrushchev was aware that years of Stalinism had had a deadening effect in several areas, creating a climate of fear and suspicion, discouraging initiative and creating a dead weight of bureaucracy at all levels of society. Khrushchev wished to end the arbitrary terror and humanise the Soviet system by improving living standards and allowing people to feel more secure. He did not intend to destroy the system, and certainly not the Party, but he did want to reduce its power by giving more power to professional managers and bureaucrats, giving more local autonomy and reducing party interference in the economy. Economically Khrushchev was well aware that there were major problems. In agriculture there was low production and an unenthusiastic peasantry. In industry he wished to grant more initiative to enterprises and to diversify, particularly to produce more consumer goods. All policies were intended to modify, not change radically, the existing system. Khrushchev did succeed in reducing the powers of Party Secretaries, but bureaucratic obstructionism reduced the impact of his efforts to make the Party more accountable. His efforts to divide the Party into agricultural and industrial wings and to reduce power at the centre did not last. The impact of economic reforms was mixed. The conversion of many collective farms into state farms did not significantly increase production. The Virgin Lands experiment was not a long term success. The rural sector remained the most backward part of the economy. Grain had to be imported from the West. In industry, attempts to rationalise the command economy also had no long term success in increasing production, initiative or quality, although there were short term increases in output. The tinkering with systems, such as the introduction of the Seven Year Plan, did not solve problems, and the economy began to show signs of stagnation, even though living standards rose.

Level 1 and Level 2 answers will probably be based on unsubstantiated assertions or generalisations with relatively little concrete detail or argument. To reach Level 3 or above, answers should be reasonably wide ranging, including some political and economic material, although not necessarily to the same depth, and with some evaluation in terms of the question. Level 4 answers will produce a range of examples to substantiate the impact of success. At Level 5 the evaluation will be well substantiated with a good range of evidence and perspective, and good links will probably be made between the different aspects.

June 2005

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.

Assess the validity of the view in **Source A** of the need for reform in the USSR at the time of Gorbachev's accession to power. (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

Answers at Level 1 will be based entirely on the extract, e.g. picks out references to frequent economic failures, declining rates of growth, the ignoring of popular opinion, weakening solidarity, major social problems. Essentially the source is being taken at face value or treated as “value by content”. To reach Level 2 candidates should introduce own knowledge or amplify some of the points made. Basically Gorbachev's analysis was correct: the economy had been stagnating for years; only a small minority of Party zealots had real faith in the system anymore and there was widespread cynicism and corruption, for example with a flourishing black market. The comment about society becoming “unmanageable” is more debatable: probably Gorbachev meant that the Party was no longer able to persuade people into the orthodox way of thinking as easily as it once had. Level 3 answers will develop these points and possibly introduce more extensive own knowledge which will help to explain Gorbachev's motives for reform either supporting or questioning the validity of the source in more depth. At Level 4 answers will be analytical throughout, combining awareness of the given standpoint with any other opinions or evidence coming from own knowledge, although it is unlikely that candidates will be able to substantiate a case that no major reform was necessary. What they may question is whether other things have been omitted, for example is little overt criticism here of the Party itself, although it is there by implication.

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

How useful is **Source B** as evidence of the impact of reform during Gorbachev’s time in power in the USSR? (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 make simple statements related to the content of the source, e.g. repeating some of the figures or giving a basic summary of trends, such as the fact that the “unofficial” figures are lower than the “official” ones. Level 2 answers will explore utility at a general level. This will largely focus on the content of the source, but will also provide some comment by bringing own knowledge to bear, e.g. pointing out that the figures showing a decline in economic performance or its uneven nature, even evident in the official figures, help to explain why Gorbachev’s reforms were largely seen as failures and to a large extent were responsible for his eventual downfall. At Level 3 answers will give more careful consideration to both utility and limitations. For example, the figures give some idea of trends, although answers should comment on the disparity between some of the figures. Which are more accurate? Is there an element of propaganda in the official figures? Both sets of figures suggest the impact of economic reform broadly, but not the detail. For example, they do not show why the reforms failed, the continuing problems of bureaucracy, the reluctance to take initiative, the opposition to reforms, the dithering of how far reform show go, the reluctance to embrace a market economy etc. Responses at Level 4 will be distinguished by candidates’ ability to form judgements based on both the source and their own knowledge, e.g. following on from the comments above, the answer will provide a substantiated assessment of the extent to which this source provides good evidence of the impact of reform, and whether this evidence is most, or only a small part of the picture.

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

“Gorbachev understood the challenges facing the USSR when he came to power, but proved incapable of meeting them successfully.”

How valid is this interpretation of Gorbachev’s domestic policy in the period 1985-1991?
(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

Answers should address both the nature of the problems faced by Gorbachev and his management of those problems. Answers are likely to focus upon political, economic and possibly social factors, although not necessarily all to the same depth. Some of the challenges are clearly suggested by the Sources: Source A with its references to economic decline, ineffective propaganda, lack of cohesion. Source B provides further evidence of a declining economy. Source C suggests that although Gorbachev started out with reforming intentions, he unleashed a can of worms and faced more problems which he could not solve, leading eventually to the break-up of the Union. Candidates should be able to use own knowledge to amplify or add to these points. Gorbachev clearly understood some of the challenges facing the USSR: especially the economic problems which had been evident for some time. Unlike some earlier reformers he did recognise that tinkering with economic systems was not enough: people must feel secure in criticising, discussing and taking initiative: hence the programme of *glasnost*. But Gorbachev could not see in 1985 that the

whole system was faulty, and he mistakenly believed that a reformed Party could stay in control of the reforming process. He made many reforms, including political ones, but also faced apathy and opposition, as well as cynicism, when it became evident that some of the *perestroika* reforms were not delivering the goods. Gorbachev dithered about which road to take, and upset both conservatives and radicals. His political reforms, including the introduction of genuine parliamentary representation, reduced his own power. He still retained a faith in the Party, right up to the failed coup. He proved incapable of meeting the existing challenges plus the development of major new ones such as nationalist tensions and Republican breakaway movements. However, it is arguable that by 1985, no one was capable of meeting the challenges whilst retaining the structure of the USSR in anything like its existing form.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to restrict themselves to describing and defining what the sources say in a general, unselective way. At Level 2 answers will show an awareness of the issues but bring only limited information or argument to bear. By Level 3 there will be some attempt to argue a case, both in terms of Gorbachev understanding the challenges and his success or otherwise in meeting them. There will be a range of evidence although it will not be exhaustive. Responses at Level 4 and above will integrate argument and evidence, although judgement may be confined to the conclusion. At Level 5 the degree of substantiated argument and range of evidence will be greater, and probably well integrated throughout the answer, possibly with a good sense of perspective also.