



General Certificate of Education

AS History 1041

Unit 1: HIS1H

Tsarist Russia, 1855–1917

Mark Scheme

2010 examination – January 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.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2010 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

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 candidates. 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 candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates 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. Candidates 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 candidates 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 candidate 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 candidates 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 candidates' 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*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate 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 candidate 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

January 2010

GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation

HIS1H: Tsarist Russia, 1855–1917

Question 1

- (a) Why did Witte promote industrialisation in Russia? (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 candidates 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.

- By the 1880s Russia was still essentially an agricultural, peasant-based society. There had been a boom in railway building and developments in the iron and oil industries since 1861, but most industry was small-scale. Many conservatives, but also some radicals, opposed industrialisation either as a potentially dangerous disruptive force or else because it was not “traditionally Russian”. Because peasants were still largely tied to the land, it was not easy to create an industrial workforce, nor was their sufficient capital.

- The change in official attitudes was largely due to Witte, Minister of Finance 1892–1903. He had a business and railway administration background and had retained his links with industry, and therefore was in favour of promoting industrialisation.
- Witte was afraid that without industrialisation, Russia would fall further behind the more advanced West. An unindustrialised Russia might even be seen as an area for colonial exploitation by other Great Powers.
- Witte's views were famously outlined in his 1899 memorandum on Industrial Development, arguing that Russia must industrialise through attracting foreign investment and direct Government intervention if Russia were to develop as a Great Power and maintain and develop its status.
- Witte believed that an industrialised, more powerful Russia would strengthen the autocracy.

(b) How far was Russia a modern industrialised state by 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 candidates 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.

- Vishnegradskii and Witte used tariffs on imports both to raise revenue and protect developing Russian industries. Witte also put the rouble on the gold standard to give foreign investors the confidence to invest in Russian industry. These measures encouraged industrial development, along with the railway building which was deliberately undertaken directly by the Government, and which in turn stimulated related industries like iron, coal and engineering.
- Witte's policies led to a considerable growth in productivity in the late 19th century. There were big increases in all indicators of industrial production. Iron and railways were particularly important. The most rapid periods of growth were in the 1890s and 1906-13,

although the latter period saw less direct government intervention. There was a slump 1899–1906.

- Despite big increases, Russia's industrial ranking compared to other Powers actually fell. Although by 1914 Russia did have a firm industrial base, it was relatively small: only 18 per cent of the population was urban, and only 20 per cent of national income came from industry. Industry tended to concentrate in certain areas: the Southern oilfields and large cities like St. Petersburg and Moscow. Growth was unbalanced, and Russia in 1914 was still predominantly a rural economy, with a lot of small, rural-based, often handicraft industries.
- Russian industry tended to be very labour-intensive and less efficient than its counterparts in some economies such as Germany and the USA.

Therefore a balanced, well-argued answer is likely to show that there were significant advances in some industries, but the overall result was limited, and therefore Russia was not a "modern industrialised state" by 1914.

Question 2

- (a) Explain why liberals were dissatisfied with the Tsarist autocracy in 1881. (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 candidates 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.

- Liberals were most likely to be educated Russians who, unlike Slavophiles who rejected western influences, wanted Russia to develop institutions such as those developing in some Western European countries. These developments had seen the extension of the franchise and the establishment of civil liberties, which benefited the developing middle class in particular. These developments were lacking in Russia. Liberals in Russia were not revolutionaries, but disliked the autocracy and their exclusion from any real influence.
- Many Liberals had initially welcomed Alexander II's reforms: the abolition of serfdom, extending education, western-style legal reforms, the establishment of zemstvos, etc. However, these reforms had their limitations, e.g. the zemstvos were dominated by the nobility. None of the reforms reduced the power of the autocracy. This was particularly evident when the reforms dried up or were modified later in Alexander II's reign.
- Alexander never showed any intention of conceding any power, until he considered some moderate constitutional reform, ironically just before his assassination in 1881. His successor was against reform from the start, so liberals had no reason to be satisfied with tsardom in 1881.

A good Level 4 answer is likely to make links between the various factors or possibly prioritise them in importance.

- (b) How important was political opposition to Nicholas II between 1914 and the February/March 1917 Revolution in bringing about the fall of the Tsarist regime?
(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 candidates 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.

- There is a debate about how stable the regime was in 1914. It had recovered from the 1905 Revolution, but both reformers and radicals were disappointed by the lack of reform, and in particular the maintenance of the autocracy.

- Although the regime still commanded traditional support, once the war started to go badly, there was dissatisfaction with the regime, if not much outright opposition at first. People were disillusioned by the military defeats and casualties; and by economic problems such as inflation and shortages of food and key materials. Efforts to increase supplies and ensure the mobilisation of resources were inadequate. There was growing unrest if not outright opposition.
- Discontent was fuelled by Nicholas's war leadership and the activities of Rasputin and Alexandra, which discredited the government. There was a tentative unity developing amongst influential people who were dissatisfied with the conduct of affairs. The Duma became hostile from 1915, when the Progressive Bloc united Octobrists, Kadets and some right wingers, with a majority in the Duma. It demanded a government which would command public confidence and unify the various groups which were helping the war effort in the absence of effective government. Nicholas replaced ministers but did nothing to inspire confidence.
- This growing lack of confidence did not by itself force out the Tsar. But increasingly, people, including traditional supporters, were less inclined to fight for him. Therefore when disturbances about living conditions and other problems broke out in 1917, and for the first time sections of the army refused to support the tsar, he had no support and was forced to abdicate.
- Therefore organised political opposition did not bring down the regime; but growing pessimism and lack of faith eroded any real political support for the tsar. There were also radicals such as Bolsheviks who were opposed to the regime from the start, but they had relatively little influence on events.
- It was the failures in war and associated domestic problems rather than organised opposition which brought down the regime, which clearly lacked political support by 1917.

A balanced answer could focus on the political opposition to Nicholas II, or equally evaluate some of the other factors responsible for the February Revolution. But whichever approach, there must be a supported and considered evaluation of the role of political opposition for a high level answer.

Question 3

(a) Why did Tsar Nicholas II summon a Duma to meet 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 candidates 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.

- Despite the fact that the dissatisfied elements in the 1905 Revolution were not united in their objectives, the regime was still under threat in 1905. The Duma was a sop to the opposition.
- Nicholas II favoured a hard-line approach to crushing revolution, but was persuaded mainly by Witte that some concessions were necessary to divide the regime's opponents. The master-stroke was the October Manifesto, which promised individual and civil rights, and in particular a Duma, or nationally elected parliament.
- This succeeded in isolating the moderate liberals from radical revolutionaries, who were crushed. Although Nicholas disliked the concession of the Duma, he accepted it because by then issuing the Fundamental Laws, he reinforced the notion of autocracy and scotched ideas that he might have to share any power. Therefore he was content to let the First Duma meet in 1906, because by then the Revolution had been crushed, order restored and he had asserted his own authority, along with sacking Witte, with whom he was still unhappy for persuading him into any concessions.

A high level answer will link the various events or prioritise them in explaining why the Duma was allowed to meet, despite Nicholas II's dislike of such an institution.

(b) How successful was Stolypin in strengthening the Tsarist regime? (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 candidates 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.

- Stolypin was appointed chief minister after the 1905 Revolution. He was a strong, intelligent, resourceful minister, although not particularly popular. He dominated government until his assassination in 1911.
- Stolypin's approach was threefold: to crush the remnants of opposition by imprisoning or executing revolutionaries; carrying out limited reform; and managing the Dumas.

- It might be argued that the repression worked in that there was no effective organised opposition to the regime 1906–1911. Most revolutionary leaders were in exile. The country was cowed by martial law.
- The Dumas were never a serious threat to the tsar's authority. After the first two were dissolved, new electoral laws ensured a more compliant Third Duma, which was on the whole effectively managed by Stolypin. His agricultural reforms aimed to create a loyal class of wealthy peasants, which would give the regime more security.
- The agricultural reforms were only partially successful. Only a minority of peasants took the opportunity to leave the *mir* and consolidate their holdings. Nevertheless, the peasants, who were freed from redemption payments, were certainly not a revolutionary threat. Nor did political parties seriously threaten the tsar's authority.
- It may be argued that longer-term stability was more of an issue, since fundamental problems were not addressed, and after Stolypin's death, there were less effective ministers and more signs of dissatisfaction. Nevertheless there was no sign of revolution in 1914, and many historians would argue that it was only the disastrous world war which finished the regime. Therefore it is possible to argue that Stolypin strengthened the regime in the short-term, but provided no long-term solution – but can he be blamed for what happened after his death?

Candidates may well debate the extent to which the regime was strengthened or weakened after 1905 – but for a high-level answer the main focus must be an evaluation of Stolypin's contribution to the regime, whether it is seen as positive, negative or a mixture of both.