



**General Certificate of Education
June 2010**

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 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

June 2010

GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation

HIS1H: Tsarist Russia, 1855–1917

Question 1

01 Why did defeat in the Crimean War lead to reform under Alexander II? (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 the 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 reforms were prompted by the Crimean war defeat.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- Alexander II came to the throne convinced that reform was necessary in order to revive Russia after the Crimean War defeat. Russia's military had been shown to be outdated and inefficient. It prompted reforms which altered the basis of conscription, principally aimed at a more professional, better trained army

- because the military system of conscription was closely tied up with serfdom, the necessary military reforms also necessitated the abolition of serfdom or at least a radical revision of it
- Russia's defeat starkly highlighted how backward Russia was generally in relation to other Great Powers, and this was dangerous for Russia's standing in Europe. The Crimean War was therefore a factor in other reforms designed to 'modernise' Russia, in education, the law and local government

To reach the higher levels, candidates will develop probably three reasons and/or link the reasons well.

Question 1

- 02** How far had Alexander II fulfilled the hopes of reformers in Russia by the time of his death in 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 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.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which suggest that Alexander II did fulfil the hopes of reformers, against others which suggest that he did not.

Factors suggesting that the reforms did fulfil the hopes of reformers might include:

- the serfs were emancipated, which may have satisfied serfs wanting personal freedom, those intellectuals who felt that serfdom was immoral and those reformers who wanted to modernise Russia
- reforms in the army may have satisfied those wanting a more modernised, humane, efficient army, rectifying the deficiencies obvious during the Crimean War
- reforms in education, broadening its provision; reforms in the legal system, which made trials fairer and reduced corruption; the establishing of zemstvos – all these reforms may have appealed to modernisers, particularly those influenced by developments in Western Europe.

Factors suggesting that the reforms did not fulfil the hopes of reformers might include:

- emancipation did not improve the condition of many serfs, and many nobles also resented the loss of their 'property'
- many of the reforms appeared to have flaws: for example, the zemstvos had restricted powers, and disappointed those wanting political reform
- Alexander reversed several of the reforms following the Polish Revolt and attempts on his life
- radical reformers and Slavophiles were certainly not appeased by the reforms. Russia remained an autocracy
- those wanting 'modernisation' were disappointed, since the changes were too restricting to allow for developments such as industrialisation or a modern, constitutional state.

Balanced answers are likely to show that Alexander's reforms whetted the appetite of some people for more change, but disappointed those like the nobility which felt left out or those who wanted more political, social and economic change. The reforms simply reinforced the opposition or radical opponents like the Populists. On the other hand, it was the first time for generations that a Tsar had implemented change, and so it showed that the regime could adapt to some extent.

Question 2

- 03** Explain why the Russian Social Democratic party split into Bolsheviks and Mensheviks in 1903. (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.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why the SDP split into the two factions.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- Lenin had a particular vision of a Party that was small, professional and revolutionary, and led by intellectuals and acting as the vanguard of a politically conscious working class. The key question therefore was, who could be a Party member? The Mensheviks, led by Martov, wanted a mass Party more akin to the large German Social Democratic Party. Lenin was prepared to have the leadership elected by a small Central Committee, but not by the mass of Party members
- Lenin wanted to focus on revolution, not reforms or attempts to get laws passed which would benefit workers (the so-called 'Economist' trend)
- personality differences were important. Martov thought that Lenin wanted to be a dictator. Lenin was known to be bullying and arrogant towards potential rivals, since he was always convinced that he was right

- there was a context of underground revolutionary activity, where intellectuals discussed and argued about political theory. Groups did fragment. In this context, the 1903 separation was not one of a large political party fragmenting, but a small political group splitting into smaller factions.

To reach the higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example they might explain the links between Lenin's personal ambition and the genuine ideological differences between opponents, or they might develop links between the political developments in the SPD and the context of the Russian political and economic situation at that time.

Question 2

- 04** How successful was Nicholas II in overcoming opposition to his regime in the years 1905 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 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.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which suggest that Nicholas II did overcome opposition to his regime, against others which suggest that he did not overcome opposition, or at least he was storing up trouble for the future.

Factors suggesting Nicholas II did overcome opposition might include:

- the regime survived the 1905 Revolution by making concessions such as the October Manifesto, dividing moderate Liberal opposition from revolutionaries, and crushing resistance from the soviet and the workers
- Nicholas was able to retain the loyalty of the army
- Stolypin was an able and strong minister, who combined moderate agricultural reform, ruthless suppression of dissent and successful manipulation of the later Dumas
- radical opposition remained weak: groups such as the Bolsheviks were relatively weak and their leaders were in exile
- from 1907 onwards, the Dumas were relatively compliant, managed by the government, and contained supporters like the Octobrists
- the regime may have gained from economic development, although this was not consistent.

Factors suggesting Nicholas was not successful in overcoming opposition might include:

- opposition was restricted but never absent. The regime had to close the first two Dumas because they challenged the Tsar's authority
- Stolypin was assassinated in 1911, and his reforms had had limited effect
- there were further outbreaks of discontent: notable the Lena Goldfields massacre
- Liberals and the aspiring middle class continued to be disappointed at the absence of real constitutional reform and their exclusion from any share of power
- there was an increase in strike activity, often politically inspired, after 1912. Candidates might debate whether this represented a serious threat to the regime.

Balanced answers may show an awareness that the issue of Nicholas II's 'success', and the degree of stability for his regime which this implies, are subjects for debate. For example, answers could argue that Nicholas was successful: revolutionaries were in exile; there were few major threats after 1906; there were still reserves of loyalty to the regime; Russia entered the First World War on a wave of patriotism. However, some candidates might argue that appearances were deceptive and that pressure was building, with a more politicised working class and evidence of frustration with the regime, and 1914 simply postponed a crisis which was close to challenging the regime on the eve of war.

Question 3

05 Explain why Lenin issued the April Theses in April 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 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.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Lenin issued the April Theses.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- Lenin had been in exile during the February Revolution and did not return to Russia until April. In his absence many of the Bolsheviks, like other political parties, had supported the Provisional Government on the grounds that the Revolution had been a classic Marxist 'First Stage', which meant it was a bourgeois stage which would develop Russia until it had a large working class and the way would be open for a 'proper' workers' or socialist revolution
- Lenin had different views. He was not an orthodox Marxist. He believed that the war had created a situation which the Bolsheviks could utilise to forgo the transitional stage and work for an immediate second revolution, led by the Bolsheviks in the name of the workers (and possibly the peasants). He was adamant that the Bolsheviks should not cooperate with the PG

- the Theses were an opportunity for Lenin to firmly establish his control over the Party, which had inevitably been weakened by long exile
- the Theses were an opportunity for Lenin to outline his philosophy and put forward radical slogans such as 'Peace, Bread and Land' and 'All power to the Soviets' as a means of attracting more supporters but also marking the Bolsheviks out as different from the PG and other parties.

To reach the higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they may link Lenin's personal concerns to reinforce his leadership of the Bolsheviks with his pragmatic philosophy which involved adapting 'Marxism' to take advantage of the political situation in which Russia found itself in 1917.

Question 3

- 06** How far was weak leadership of the Provisional Government responsible for its overthrow 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 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.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points supporting importance against others which do not, and the answer could be exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Factors suggesting the importance of weak leadership in causing the overthrow of the Government might include:

- the PG lacked strong leadership from the beginning, partly because it was not elected and lacked authority, and partly because it faced challenges from elsewhere, particularly from the Soviet
- Prime Minister Kerensky might be regarded as having made some crucial mistakes: for example his disastrous Summer Offensive, and his handling of the Kornilov episode
- Kerensky was also regarded as vain, obsessive and lacking sufficient nous
- the government increasingly lacked credibility: it postponed major reforms such as land reform and elections and had limited support, especially from the army
- the Government proved unable to stop radical and determined opposition.

Factors suggesting other reasons besides weak leadership for the overthrow of the Government might include:

- the continuing problems caused by an unsuccessful and costly war, which would have tested any government
- the activities of the Bolsheviks in ruthlessly taking advantage of opportunities and the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky
- growing disillusionment in the army
- the power vacuum in Russia which only the Bolsheviks seemed capable of utilising to their advantage.

Good answers **should** focus mainly on the weaknesses of the Government; but in order to assess 'how far', there should also be some attempt to address other factors such as Bolshevik activity in contributing to the overthrow of the government, with an overall assessment/judgement.