



**General Certificate of Education
June 2012**

AS History 1041

HIS1H

Unit 1H

Tsarist Russia, 1855–1917

Final

Mark Scheme

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 events which all examiners participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each examiner analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised 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 students' 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 to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools and colleges 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 schools and colleges 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.

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level students. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how students have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Students who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Students who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Students who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b): AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which students meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a student performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that students might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other students' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Students should never be doubly penalised. If a student with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a student with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

June 2012

GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation

HIS1H: Tsarist Russia, 1855–1917

Question 1

- 01** Explain why Alexander II introduced further reforms following the Emancipation Edict of 1861. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Alexander II embarked on a programme of further reforms after the Emancipation Edict of 1861. Students might include some of the following factors:

- serfdom had given nobles complete jurisdiction over the lives of their serfs. Once the system of private serf ownership was abolished, the legal system would require adaptation to cope

- serfdom had been compatible with military conscription, but emancipating the serfs created free peasants who needed to support themselves. This was not compatible with 25 years of compulsory military service, so military reform was necessary
- Emancipation led to a need for further reform of local government. This produced the Zemstva and town dumas.

In addition there are other broader reasons for the continued reforms including:

- readdressing the problems highlighted by Russia's defeat in the Crimean War
- economically, Russia faced problems and was considered backwards. Reforms to the education system at school and university level, as well as changes to the system of censorship, were needed to promote economic modernisation
- there was some considerable support for reform, particularly from Westernisers who sought to modernise Russia through economic reform. Some Westernisers held influential positions at Court
- Alexander II's own views influenced further reforms. He was convinced of the need to reform, both to create a more modern, humane and competitive Russia and to maintain his own autocratic position.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. Those who make good links to the results of the Emancipation should be placed in Level 4 along with those who show linkage in terms of prioritisation, themes or a long/short-term division.

Question 1

- 02** How successful were Alexander II's reforms in strengthening the Tsarist regime in the years 1855 to 1881? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which support the success of reforms in increasing the strength of the Tsarist regime against points which suggest reforms were less successful at increasing its strength.

Factors supporting the argument that reforms successfully strengthened the Tsarist regime might include:

- the Emancipation of the Serfs in 1861 heralded a period of reform and gave unprecedented freedoms to over 90 million people creating greater loyalty
- reform of the army, local government, the military, the Church, education and a relaxation of censorship could be regarded as strengthening and successful. They were designed to modernise Russia and strengthen the regime in the wake of defeat in the Crimean War and increasing awareness of the industrial development taking place in some European countries
- the Zemstva and town dumas harnessed the energies of the professionals and intelligentsia in strengthening tsarist government and promoting welfare and economic growth
- industrial growth was stimulated by the reform of the economy and government sponsorship and helped strengthen the economic basis of the regime
- reforms pacified many of those who were seeking change, including Westernisers and Liberal intellectuals, who worked with the Tsardom
- after some sporadic outbreaks of violence in the early 1860s, there was little evidence of direct opposition that threatened the stability of the regime
- the response of peasants in the 1870s to Populist agitators suggest most peasants were satisfied by reform. The Russian Orthodox Church was pivotal in ensuring the loyalty of most subjects to the tsar, whom they considered to be divinely appointed. This strengthened the state.

Students are likely to develop the nature and extent of the reforms in some depth and would be expected to do so in order to provide the balance necessary for higher levels.

Factors supporting the argument that reforms were less successful in strengthening the Tsarist regime might include:

- the particular terms of the Emancipation Edict came as a disappointment to many, including peasants. There was resentment over Redemption payments, the pressure of a rising population and land hunger made the situation worse. Outbreaks of violence were widespread
- the nobility resented a loss of cheap labour following emancipation. Many were in debt before the Emancipation Edict, having mortgaged their serfs. The long term nature of compensation in the form of redemption payments caused further economic difficulty to this group. This limited their ability to invest in economic modernisation
- education for most Russians remained limited, despite some liberalisation of universities. In agriculture, education had little impact. Ideas about agricultural modernisation did not spread and the mir remained un-enterprising in their management of villages. The regime's economic basis was not as strong as it appeared
- the introduction of Zemstva and town dumas did not satisfy those seeking a national political voice, and indeed their work at a local level fuelled demands for greater involvement in national government
- legal reforms such as more open trials and the introduction of trial by jury, while significant, still did not address "political" crimes. Government officials retained wide powers. Incidents such as the Vera Zasulich case undermined the credibility of the regime
- the pace of reform slowed in the mid-1860s, particularly after the Polish Revolt of 1863 and repeated attempts on the tsar's life. Reliance on repression suggests the regime was not strong

- radicals and intellectuals who demanded significant political change did not have their demands met, as the government remained autocratic. Autocracy bred opposition and therefore lacked true strength.

In conclusion, students may suggest that the reforms actually had a de-stabilising effect, although they could, of course, make a valid case for the importance of reforms in strengthening the autocracy. Reward any well-supported judgement.

Question 2

03 Explain why Nicholas II issued the Fundamental Laws in 1906. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

L1: Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

L2: Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**

L3: Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

L4: Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why the in 1906 Tsar introduced the Fundamental Laws.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- the Tsar had been pressurised in 1905 into granting political concessions he did not truly support. This Tsar had, previously, referred to notions of democracy as “senseless dreams” but had granted a Duma to calm the situation. He therefore needed to state his views and position
- by 1906, the political situation appeared more stable. Troops returning from war with Japan could be used to repress opponents of the regime. In the cities, the soviets had been disbanded. In rural areas, repression was brutal. The tsar was more confident
- Liberals were not likely to pose any form of revolutionary threat. It was clear that many middle class people, were horrified by the events of 1905 and wanted to distance themselves from radical and working class violence and would so accept the ‘Fundamental Laws’

- the Tsar's belief in his Divine Right to rule Russia as an autocrat remained unchanged. The Fundamental Laws were introduced to restate that authority and remove any ambiguity that may have arisen from the October Manifesto
- the terms of the October Manifesto itself were the work of advisors, notably Witte. The Tsar wanted to retract some of the concessions made, such as the apparent ability granted to the Duma to legislate. Introducing the need for the Tsar to approve any Act passed by the Duma reduced it effectively to an advisory body.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given: for example they might make effective links between the motives for introducing the Fundamental Laws (e.g. the relationship between ideological and practical factors), or prioritise the motives, perhaps emphasising Nicholas's belief in 'autocracy'. Please note that some students may only develop one or two factors but if done well, such answers can be considered for Level 3, and Level 4, if strong linkage is present.

Question 2

- 04** How successful was the Tsarist regime in bringing political stability to Russia in the years 1906 to 1914? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which suggest the tsarist regime was successful in dealing bringing stability to Russia in the years 1906 to 1914 against those which suggest it was not.

Factors supporting the argument that the tsarist regime was successful in bringing political stability to Russia in the years 1906 to 1914 include:

- the immediate crisis following the 1905 Revolution was averted. Any overt opposition that remained following the granting of concessions was dealt with harshly by repression
- the Duma was kept under control through a mixture of skilful handling by Stolypin. Twice it was dissolved early, due to the perceived radical nature of its elected members. Changes to the electoral laws in 1908 delivered a more compliant Duma
- the work of successive Dumas contributed to relatively progressive social reforms, such as sickness and accident insurance, which created for many a sense that Russia was moving forward. In rural areas, the work of the zemstva contributed to an expansion in education. Social stability increased political stability
- economic reforms and an economic boom contributed to political stability. Stolypin's agricultural reforms helped create a class of more prosperous peasants who were political supporters of the regime
- the tercentenary celebrations of the Romanov dynasty and even the outbreak of war itself provided opportunities for Russians to demonstrate outwardly their loyalty to the Tsarist regime
- the use of harsh repression destroyed opposition. Many radical leaders were exiled. This helped the political stability.

Factors supporting the argument that the tsarist regime was less successful in bringing stability to Russia in the years 1906 to 1914 include:

- the Duma caused numerous problems for the Tsar. He was concerned about compromising his autocratic powers and used the Fundamental Laws to restate his authority. The necessity of repeatedly dissolving the Duma indicates how unstable the political situation might have been
- social reforms had limited impact. Workers were increasingly discontented and by 1912 there was a wave of strikes and industrial action. The Tsar's response was repression and brutal incidents like the Lena Goldfields Massacre illustrate how stability was achieved through force
- in the economy, serious problems remained and led to discontent, which manifested itself in political strikes; in the countryside there was widespread unrest and Stolypin's reforms were too slow to bring stability
- opposition was not eliminated: the SRs assassinated Stolypin in 1911.

Good answers are likely to address a range of factors in coming to a balanced judgement. The emphasis should be on the degree of **political** stability achieved by 1914, but economic and social issues are worthy of credit if used relevantly. It is likely that students will suggest that the political 'stability' of 1914 was in fact illusory although they should be credited for a well-supported judgement, whatever their view.

Question 3

- 05** Explain why the Provisional Government kept Russia in the First World War after February/March 1917. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why the Provisional Government kept Russia in the war after the February/March revolution in 1917. Students might include some of the following factors:

- the Provisional Government was indeed provisional and considered it appropriate to defer major policy decisions until elections for a Constituent Assembly could be held
- Russia was in a state of economic chaos and heavily dependent on the war credits offered by the allies for fighting. Loss of the war credits could lead to complete economic collapse
- leadership of the Provisional Government was essentially conservative in its values and key members like Kerensky and Milyukov favoured a continuation of war out of a sense of honour and duty
- despite the unpopularity of war among many ordinary people, there was still a belief that Russia could win and gain territory in the process. Defeat was not considered a certainty by any means

- only a victory and annexations would provide Russia with the income it needed to repair war damage. It therefore seemed to make sense to continue particularly since wartime production had improved in 1916.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given: for example, they might make effective links between the motives for remaining in the war (e.g. the relationship between economic and military factors), or prioritise the motives, e.g. stressing the need to avoid disastrous humiliation at a time of political uncertainty.

Question 3

- 06** How important was the role of Lenin in bringing about the overthrow of the Provisional Government in October/November 1917? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how important' and 'how successful' questions, the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question

Students should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which support Lenin's importance in explaining the overthrow of the Provisional Government against those which suggest he played a less important role, or that other factors contributed.

Factors which suggest Lenin played an important role might include:

- on his return from exile in April 1917, Lenin established the unique identity of the Bolsheviks as a party opposed both to the continuation of the war and to the Provisional Government itself. Previously, the party had worked alongside the Provisional Government
- Lenin's intellectual credibility was established and under his leadership, the Bolsheviks adopted slogans, e.g. as in the April Theses, designed to appeal to a range of people. These simplified and adapted ideology to suit the circumstances of 1917
- Lenin capitalised on other groups' loss of interest in the soviets in order to embed Bolshevik dominance by Autumn. He recognised the key role soviets could play in legitimising a revolution
- Lenin was responsible for the timing of the October/November revolution, persuading party colleagues the time was right.

Factors which suggest Lenin played a less important role might include:

- Trotsky played a pivotal role in the planning and organisation of the revolution, as well as in the Petrograd Soviet in the preceding weeks
- Lenin was not actually present in Russia for much of 1917 and relied on colleagues. Some events (e.g. July Days) were out of his control.

Other factors that may have contributed to the overthrow of the Provisional Government in October/November 1917 could include:

- the Provisional Government itself had inherent weaknesses including a lack of legitimate authority, which hampered its ability and willingness to cope with the problems it faced
- Prince Lvov and Kerensky provided weak leadership and the Kornilov affair played into the Bolsheviks' hands
- the context of 1917 was one of unique problems such as the continuation of war and the issue of land redistribution, which the Provisional Government did not fully address.

To reach higher levels, students need to assess Lenin's contribution and they may (but do not have to) weigh Lenin's contribution against other factors. Reward any 'balanced' approach. It is likely students will give Lenin a good deal of credit – but they must be able to assess, even if only to discredit, the opposing view. Students who offer only limited and generalist material on Lenin are unlikely to rise above Level 3. Some attention to Lenin's part in Oct/Nov 1917 would be expected at Level 4/5.

Converting marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion