



**General Certificate of Education  
January 2011**

**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](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2011 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 2011

**GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation**

**HIS1H: Tsarist Russia, 1855–1917**

**Question 1**

**01** Explain why Alexander II slowed the pace of reform from the mid-1860s. (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 Alexander II slowed the pace of reform after the mid 1860s.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- although Alexander II had taken a personal interest in many of the important reforms of the early 1860s, he was deterred from further experiments by assassination attempts against him in 1866 and 1867, attributed to the growth of radical ideas inspired by recent

educational reforms. Tolstoy, the new Education Minister, was much more conservative than his predecessor

- the Tsar always felt it his duty to keep his autocratic position intact, and therefore felt the need to resist the rise of radical groups like the Populists
- Alexander was disappointed that the public response to his reforms, including Emancipation, was not more positive
- Intellectual and peaceful criticism of Tsarist policies was becoming more threatening and even violent. Incidents like the 1863 Polish revolt and increasing demands for constitutional reform began to worry the Establishment
- the Tsar increasingly withdrew from public life, giving influence to more conservative ministers
- events such as the surprise acquittal of Vera Zasulich alarmed the authorities into more repressive measures like censorship
- answers which point out that reform did not die out completely, e.g. the Tsar was contemplating some limited constitutional reform at the time of his assassination, should be credited.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might prioritise the reasons into which they think were the most significant and the least significant. They may effectively link Alexander II's concerns to his original motives for reform, and/or explain the reaction to specific reforms which created distrust in Government circles.

---

**Question 1**

- 02** How successful was the tsarist regime in overcoming opposition in the years 1863 to 1894? (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 judgment 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.

Factors suggesting that the regime was successful in overcoming opposition might include:

- although there had been some examples of disappointment with Alexander II's reforms, e.g. peasant riots after the terms of Emancipation were announced, there is little evidence that after 1863 his reforms provoked a serious opposition, although some Liberals felt that the reforms did not go far enough, and Slavophiles disliked even some of the more moderate developments
- Alexander II's regime survived particular pressures: e.g. assassination attempts in the 1860s and the Polish revolt
- although there was the growth of opposition groups, e.g. Populists, anarchists, terrorist groups, they did not seriously deflect the regime from its policies. For example, the Populists were unsuccessful in their attempts to stir up the peasantry in their 'Going to the people' movement. Although Alexander II was affected by opposition, his regime resisted attempts at fundamental change, although he also made timely concessions, e.g. the Zemstvos were partly an attempt to give the nobility some of the local influence which had been diluted by Emancipation
- Alexander III, influenced by reactionaries, was even more determined to maintain the autocracy, and clamped down heavily on opposition groups, which began to include Marxists. The autocracy was reinforced by censorship and the secret police. Policies such as new educational restrictions and appointing land captains showed that the Government was in control. It could still count on great reserves of loyalty.

Factors suggesting that the regime was not totally successful in overcoming opposition might include:

- Alexander II was eventually assassinated – although this did not destroy the tsarist regime.
- despite Alexander III's firm policies, opposition was not entirely eradicated – it was just driven further underground; and there was a growth in liberal sentiment, which whilst not advocating the overthrow of tsarism, did argue for political reform which would give more Russians a say in the political process
- in the longer term, the regime did find it increasingly difficult to resist opposition – witness the 1905 Revolution and 1917. Possibly the regime was storing trouble up for the future.

Good answers are likely may show an awareness of the varied nature of the opposition, and explore both similarities and differences between the reigns of Alexander II and Alexander III. Answers may explore the differences between on the one hand 'dissatisfaction' with the regime or particular policies, and on the other hand outright opposition, which involved relatively few people. When did dissatisfaction become opposition, and when did opposition become resistance?



---

**Question 2**

- 03** Explain why, in the years 1906 to 1911, Stolypin attempted to reform agriculture. (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 Stolypin promoted reform. The November 1905 law cancelled all redemption payments from 1907. Notably, the 1906 law allowed peasants to demand that allotment land be separated from the commune; also it declared that land belonged to the head of the household, not the whole family, and allowed landowners to consolidate their strips into a separate farm. Stolypin also encouraged emigration to Siberia.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- peasant uprisings during the 1905 Revolution alarmed the Government and signified growing unrest by peasants with their difficulties such as land hunger and famine. Stolypin was anxious to re-establish the peasantry's traditional loyalty to the regime
- existing agricultural arrangements discouraged innovation and initiative in farming, whilst farming techniques were often primitive and unproductive
- Stolypin wanted to create a new class of conservative, wealthy peasants who would buttress the regime in the countryside and prevent a recurrence of unrest or revolution

- peasants were the majority of the population, and yet had been a comparatively neglected group before 1905, and little had been done for them since the flawed reform of emancipation. A healthy peasantry would produce other benefits, such as having more grain available for exports.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example the links between Stolypin's political and economic motives, and the link between the longer-term causes of rural problems and the shorter-term threats revealed by the 1905 Revolution.

---

**Question 2**

- 04** How successful was the tsarist regime in overcoming the economic backwardness of Russia in the years 1881 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 judgment 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.

Factors suggesting that economic backwardness was steadily being overcome by 1914 might include:

- from the 1880s in particular the Government had made a conscious decision to promote industrial growth, due particularly to the efforts of Witte. He persuaded governments between 1892 and 1903 to stimulate industry in various ways (although there had previously been strategies to increase government revenue and to improve communications), including higher tariffs to protect Russian industry, putting the rouble on the gold standard, encouraging foreign investment in Russia and building railways
- there was a considerable growth in industry, with a growth rate before 1900 of up to 8% a year. There was a serious slump 1899–1906, but then considerable growth again after 1906, with some industry less dependent on foreign investment. There was less reliance on handicrafts and a few large contributors like textiles. There was a growth in large industrial cities and wage labour
- Russia by 1914 had a well established base for further industrial development
- there was some improvement in agriculture, especially after Stolypin's reforms encouraged agricultural enterprise.

Factors suggesting that Russia had still not overcome its economic backwardness by 1914 might include:

- despite industrial progress, the economy was still mainly agriculturally based compared to some other great powers
- the impact of Stolypin's agricultural reforms was limited: agriculture was still relatively primitive, and only a minority of peasants took advantage of Stolypin's reforms
- although there was a rapid increase in Russian industry, Russia did not catch up with more advanced economies, and in some ways fell further behind
- growth was unbalanced. More outlying areas of the Russian Empire were neglected; the vast natural resources of areas like Siberia were scarcely exploited
- in associated areas there were still major deficiencies: communications were overall still very poor, restricting internal and external trade; the living conditions of many peasants and workers declined, affecting productivity.

Good answers are likely to show an awareness that the economic growth in this period was unbalanced, and despite developments, in many respects the Russian economy had weaknesses that were to be exposed, especially when war came in 1914. Good answers should include both agriculture and industry, although not necessarily to the same extent.

---

**Question 3**

**05** Explain why Nicholas II was forced to abdicate in 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 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 Nicholas II abdicated.

Candidates might include some of the following longer-term factors:

- dissatisfaction with the tsarist regime had simmered and grown for some time: partly from revolutionaries, partly from liberals wanting constitutional reform and a growing professional, middle class which felt excluded from power and influence
- there was a legacy of distrust from the 1905 Revolution and disappointment at institutions like the duma, which had not lived up to their supporters' expectations.

Candidates are also likely to refer to some of the following short-term and immediate factors:

- the Tsar had come under increasing criticism during the war because of his personal leadership of the army; the influence of the Tsarina and Rasputin in the Government, and the refusal of the Tsar to cooperate with groups like the duma which were trying to have a positive impact on government.

- there was disillusion with the defeats in war, the heavy casualties, and problems on the home front, particularly affecting the economy
- Nicholas II's perceived incompetence meant that he was losing the support of the army and traditional supporters amongst the nobility, as well as the peasantry. He simply commanded too little support by 1917, even though groups wanting him to go often had little else in common.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might develop the links between short- and longer-term factors; or they might distinguish between different types of factors such as political, economic and social; or they might prioritise the reasons in order of importance.

**Question 3**

- 06** How far was popular dissatisfaction with 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 judgment 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

Factors suggesting that popular dissatisfaction with the Government was significant might include:

- the Government delayed the promised elections for a Constituent Assembly and land reform, thereby upsetting peasants particularly
- the Government's continuation of the war proved unpopular, especially after the failed June Offensive
- some people considered that the Government had no legitimacy because it was self-appointed, and for many people the Soviet had more credibility
- popular dissatisfaction was evident during the July Days
- by the autumn of 1917 the Government had very few people left to support it when the Government was attacked by the Bolsheviks.

Factors suggesting that other factors might have been responsible for the overthrow of the Government might include:

- the decisive leadership of the Bolsheviks provided by Lenin and Trotsky. The Bolsheviks were the only Party capable of filling the power vacuum
- the Government made specific mistakes, such as strengthening the Bolsheviks by Kerensky's misjudgements during the Kornilov Revolt and forcing Lenin into a strike against the Government by moving against them without sufficient force in the autumn
- there were a series of other major issues such as the economy which were not necessarily the direct fault of the Government, but its failure to address them rebounded on the Government.

Good answers are likely to show an awareness that the October/November Revolution was caused by many factors, which certainly included popular dissatisfaction but also a range of other factors, although they were all linked. In order to address the issue of 'how far' and reach the higher levels, answers should address the issue of popular dissatisfaction, but also evaluate other factors at least to some extent and then make a supported judgement about the extent to which the issue of popular dissatisfaction was particularly significant or otherwise.