

AS

# History

Paper 1H Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855–1917  
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

---

---

Version: 1.0

---

---

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer 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 associates 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 associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate 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, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

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 from [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

**AS History Paper 1 Specimen Mark Scheme****1H Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855–1917****Section A**

- |          |          |   |                   |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|
| <b>0</b> | <b>1</b> | With reference to these extracts and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two extracts provides the more convincing interpretation of the consequences of Alexander II's reforms? | <b>[25 marks]</b> |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|

*Target: AO3*

*Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.*

**Generic Mark Scheme**

- |            |   |              |
|------------|---|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. They will evaluate the extracts thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated judgement on which offers the more convincing interpretation. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context.   | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion as to which offers the more convincing interpretation. However, not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements may be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | The answer will show a reasonable understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. Comments as to which offers the more convincing interpretation will be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context.  | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | The answer will show some partial understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be some undeveloped comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context.  | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | The answer will show a little understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be only unsupported, vague or generalist comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context.  | <b>1-5</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.   | <b>0</b>     |

**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.**

In responding to this question, students may choose to respond to each extract in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach to individual arguments. Either approach could be equally valid, and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate or challenge.

**Extract A: In their identification of Christian’s argument, students may refer to the following:**

- the claim that the peasants’ situation did not change significantly
- the claim that the nobility and intelligentsia were disillusioned by the reforms
- the claim that the reforms did encourage some Russians to become more radical, even revolutionary in their attitude towards the regime
- the claim that the government was successful in ‘steering its way between the various interest groups’.

**In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:**

- the peasants’ economic situation in particular was not much changed by their emancipation. Land was still an issue
- some intellectuals did not feel that the reforms went far enough and many nobles resented measures like the abolition of serfdom
- there was increased radical and revolutionary attitude amongst some Russians
- it is true to some extent that the government was successful as autocracy remained intact
- students may challenge the claim that the changes were an important ‘first step towards modernity’ since many political, economic and social features of Russia were still quite backward and not all social relationships were ‘significantly’ altered for some time to come, even right up to the 1917 Revolution.

**Extract B: In their identification of Waldron’s argument, students may refer to the following:**

- the claim that the reforms were only a starting point towards modernisation
- the claim that elected representatives now had an important role to play in government
- the claim that ‘the solid autocratic front’ had changed.

---

**In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:**

- in many respects Russia was still a ‘backward state’ which is precisely why there were ‘further calls for change’
- the creation of the zemstva brought an element of self-government to regions outside the capital
- there had been several reforms in a short space of time and there was even some discussion during Alexander II’s reign, mainly towards the end, of possible modifications to the autocratic general government
- students may challenge the assertion that the autocracy had been ‘seriously breached’ because the tsarist autocracy was still very much in control, despite its critics and opponents
- students may challenge the assertion that the nobility had ‘common attitudes’. There were considerable differences, e.g. between richer and poorer members of the aristocracy and different views on some political and social issues
- students may challenge the impression given in the extract that the pace of change was moving at such a rapid pace and in so dangerous a manner for the autocracy.

Students may conclude that both interpretations have some validity, although equally some of their assertions might be challenged. Extract B might be regarded as giving a more exaggerated interpretation of the significance and pace of the changes taking place.

**Section B**

**0 2** 'Backwardness in industry severely weakened the Russian economy in the years between 1861 and 1914.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

**[25 marks]**

*Target: AO1*

*Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.*

**Generic Mark Scheme**

- |            |  |              |
|------------|--|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement.   | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated.   | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question.   | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment.   | <b>1-5</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.  | <b>0</b>     |

---

**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.**

**Arguments supporting the view that the Russian economy was severely weakened by backwardness in industry might include:**

- Alexander II's reforms, notably the emancipation of the serfs, did not improve agriculture or free up resources for industry to the extent that was hoped
- Russia remained a country of limited industrial development. Russian industry continued to fall further behind other leading Powers
- where there were developments, e.g. in the oil industry and newer industries such as metallurgy, they were uneven geographically and older industries like textiles were neglected
- attempts at reform were mostly unsuccessful in strengthening the economy
- there were periodic periods of economic recession, e.g. in 1900-1903.

**Arguments challenging the view that the Russian economy was severely weakened by backwardness in industry might include:**

- some industries did develop significantly, e.g. iron, coal, machine production and railways, contributing to economic stability
- there were particularly notable developments in some areas, particularly in the Ukraine and the Urals and industrialisation in Southern Russia was stimulated by coal production
- Witte made determined attempts to develop the economy with pockets of success and he did attract more investment capital into the economy; whilst the growth of a domestic market reduced the dependence on imports
- industrial growth was rapid between 1906–13, at a faster rate than in most countries.

Students might conclude that there were both positives and negatives in Russia's industrial development. They might debate whether Russia was really undergoing any sort of economic transformation, because despite some improvements, Russia was starting from a low base and there were still substantial economic issues by 1914 which also had an impact on social and political stability.

- 0 3** 'The collapse of the tsarist regime in February 1917 was due to its continuing inability to retain the support of peasants and workers since the accession of Alexander III in 1881.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

**[25 marks]**

*Target: AO1*

*Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.*

### Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**



## 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.**

**Arguments supporting the view that the collapse of the tsarist regime in February 1917 was due to its inability to retain the support of peasants and workers since the accession of Alexander III, might include:**

- peasants were unhappy with their situation. If anything their conditions worsened, with more pressure from a growing population and the Stolypin land reforms did not help the majority of peasants
- none of the tsars considered any political reform which would grant ordinary people a greater say in how the country was run
- there were serious disturbances in both the towns and the countryside in 1905 which could have been serious for the regime had all those discontented been more coordinated in their protests and actions
- Nicholas II lost support in all quarters during the First World War because of military and economic failures and the court increasingly fell into disrepute
- Nicholas II's inability to deal effectively with the February 1917 crisis eliminated most of any remaining support he still had. Workers in particular had not had any significant respite from the terrible working and living conditions in industrial cities.

**Arguments challenging the view that the collapse of the tsarist regime in February 1917 was due to its inability to retain the support of peasants and workers since the accession of Alexander III, might include:**

- 'the 'Little Father' retained the traditional loyalty towards the regime of many workers and peasants, almost to the end of Nicholas II's reign
- the tsars had shown the ability to override crises before, e.g. in 1905, Nicholas II's regime retained the support of many ordinary people because there were those who feared the violent or radical change which was threatened by revolutionary groups
- the tsars benefited sometimes from strong ministers, e.g. Stolypin, who provided moderate reform and opportunities for peasants in particular to do better for themselves at the same time as providing firm government
- the crisis of February 1917 arose from various factors, but probably the main one was the catastrophic performance by Russia in the First World War. This was not just a fault of the regime: most countries were overwhelmed by the demands of total war and Russia was just not equipped to meet these demands
- it is possible to some extent to separate the qualities of the rulers from the regime itself. Alexander III had faults, but he was a strong ruler and was not under great threat during his reign. Nicholas II was singularly poorly equipped to lead Russia into a challenging period in its history and a more effective personality might have dealt with the challenges, retained support and thereby preserved the regime much more effectively.

Students might conclude that the regime did fail to retain the support of peasants and workers when it came to the crunch and that it was to a large extent the regime's fault and the tsar must take much of the blame. Students may also note that the collapse of the regime in February 1917 was down to factors, particularly the impact of the war, which might have overwhelmed anybody.