

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Pre-U Certificate

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2012 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

9769 HISTORY

9769/71

Paper 5 (Special Subject – Russia in Revolution, 1905–1924), maximum raw mark 60

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- Cambridge will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2012 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	71

Special Subjects: Document Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

This question is designed largely to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.

Examiners should be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.

The Band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result not all answers fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.

In marking an answer examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Question (a)

Band 1: 8–10

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Band 2: 4–7

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the thrust of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the Band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the Band.

Band 3: 0–3

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	71

Question (b)

Band 1: 16–20

The answer will treat the documents as a set and will make very effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It will be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material will be handled confidently with strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge will be demonstrated. The material deployed will be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument will be well structured. Historical concepts and vocabulary will be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. English will be fluent, clear and virtually error-free.

Band 2: 11–15

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may well be absent at the lower end of the Band. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary and will be expressed in clear, accurate English.

Band 3: 6–10

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected, or especially at the lower end of the Band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may well be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places. Analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated. Although use of English should be generally clear there may well be some errors.

Band 4: 0–5

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely whilst understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may well be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished. English will lack real clarity and fluency and there will be errors.

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	71

Special Subject Essays

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and must be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners should give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may well yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 2 mark.
- (e) The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Band 1: 25–30

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this Band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this Band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	71

Band 2: 19–24

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this Band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Band 3: 13–18

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Use of relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

Band 4: 7–12

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may well be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear although lacking in real fluency.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	71

Band 5: 0–6

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	71

1 (a) How far do Document A and B differ in their approaches to the prospects for reform?
[10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. Where appropriate, the answer should demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation and awareness of provenance by use not only of the text, but of headings and attributions. The proximity of dates in 1906 can be commented upon, as can the authorship, with due attention given to the place of Stolypin. Much can be made of the tones of A and B. The former (A) is negative, even pessimistic, almost rejecting the idea of reform and firmly down-playing any meaningful role for the Duma, where groups did have reform plans and hopes. The latter (B) offers contrasts, there is hope, there is the prospect of some significant reforms-leading to important changes; there is a positive tone. While A rejects ideas of changes to land tenure and upholds the Tsarist dominance and prerogatives in making laws as well as the sense of arbitrariness linked to controls and the powers of the regime, B points to considerations of a range of freedoms, changes in land tenure and in provisions for workers. None of this would seem possible given the tenor of A. Candidates may consider whether a shift was occurring or had occurred, or whether Stolypin's proposals were less regime-based, more personal. Possibly A reflects the imprint of the Tsar and loyalty to his word, while B reflects a more personalised agenda. B seems to suggest a freedom of manoeuvre denied to ministers in A. While A seems to rule out political-constitutional changes, B might be said to offer some suggestion of future changes if the proposals were to be enacted. The prospects for reform, apparently bleak in A, seem better in B.

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	71

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the Tsarist regime's disagreements with the Dumas were the main reason that Russia became de-stabilised in the period 1906–14? [20]**

The answer should treat the documents as a set and make effective use of each, although, depending on the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently and with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong both in range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. E provides a useful overview and links well with the other documents. It raises issues of disagreements and conflicts but also other de-stabilising factors. Candidates can refer to prevailing political, economic and social conditions, in the aftermath of the 1905 Revolution. The Fundamental Laws of 1906 had effectively limited, if not emasculated, the roles of the Dumas, though that did not stop challenges and criticisms; A and C and some of D can be linked in here. B relates to the spirit of reform pursued after the Revolution but D and E suggest various limits to those reforms. A to D all suggest tensions between the Tsar, his ministers and the Dumas, in turn related to some parts of E. Topic knowledge of the scope and character of Stolypin's reforms could be used, within the context of agrarian and especially industrial developments (downturn, upturn) in the period. Political issues and tensions were important also: the rejection of any form of constitutional monarchy; the severe limits placed on the Dumas; the changes to electoral laws (C, E); the growth of a range of opposition parties, inside and outside the Dumas (D, E; topic knowledge of the Left especially). Comments on the language and tone of Documents A to D would be useful; they indicate attitudes, stances, even a sense of temperament. Apart from B and D and their contrasts, A and C can offer further contrasts in places and can be linked to D in terms of Duma claims and requests for action, and outcomes in terms of limited changes. There were certainly tensions between the Tsar, never an easy character and determined to uphold his autocratic status, and the Dumas, even more muted after the changes to the electoral laws. But there were other issues involved in the de-stabilisation of Russia in the period. A recognises the needs of rural reforms, thereby linking with areas of B, but rejects Duma demands, setting out clear areas of demarcation; B proposes a reform programme, linked to A, while D comments on some outcomes; C has importance as the Tsar's statement of intent, control, power and a rejection of Duma claims to any meaningful role. E has links to all, also advancing a sense of other factors – unrest, violence, militancy (especially 1912–16), and points to the Duma's role in encouraging a different political atmosphere. Stolypin's death is seen as significant in E, as is noble opposition to reforms and change. Contextual knowledge can refer to issues over the state of Tsardom, its strengths and weaknesses – much debated – and the ties of economic and political problems. The consequences of the 1905 Revolution were felt in the years ahead, at different levels, creating further tensions and leading to challenges to stability, law and order and Tsarist autocracy (well demonstrated in C).

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	71

2 'Without the First World War, there would have been no Bolshevik Revolution.' How far do you agree with this view? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demand of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. A narrative or even description of the First World War will not go very far at all unless there is a good level of explanation related to the terms of the question. The time-span will be (August) 1914 to (October) 1917. Answers will need good analysis and evaluation of the nature of the War and how it destabilised Russia, led to the fall of the Tsarist dynasty and system and led on to a power vacuum filled uneasily by the Provisional Government, overthrown by Lenin and the Bolsheviks. The military defeats, economic, financial and social crises, blame on the Tsar and advisers, growing morale problems and domestic unrest, violence, mutinies in the army and the roles of the Progressive Bloc and the Rightist elites can be assessed. In turn, the takeover by the Provisional Government (in reality, a series of uneasy coalitions), the promises made, the mistakes made (promises unkept, continuation of war, failure to quash the Bolsheviks in and after the 'July Days'), the leadership of Kerensky, the Kornilov Affair, the weakening and narrowing appeal and support-base should be considered. These areas then provide the context to the position of Lenin and the Bolsheviks, the appeal and message, extent of support, vicissitudes, and the chance to seize power in October (Trotsky, MRC, weak Provisional Government forces, etc). The failure of previous regimes (Tsarist, Provisional) may have given the Bolsheviks their chance.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. The question formulation opens up argument and counter-argument, and there is scope for some debate, not least with links to views about the strength or weaknesses of the Tsarist regime in 1914 and about how far the War destroyed it; equally, links to views that, contrary to later Soviet historical thinking, there was no inevitability about the Bolshevik accession to power. Candidates may adjudge the collapse of the Tsarist regime as certain once war started and went badly, but that will not explain the Bolshevik takeover; rather it will set the context of a power vacuum uneasily filled by the Provisional Government; then Lenin and the Bolsheviks had their chance.

AO3 [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not explicitly be penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 10	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	71

3 How valid is the judgement that the Reds won the Civil War (1918–21) because their opponents were deeply divided? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demand of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. A narrative of the main events of the Civil War will need good explanation relating to the question's terms to go far; good analysis and evaluation are required. Candidates will need to balance the Reds' strengths, advantages and successes against the Whites' weaknesses, disadvantages, errors and mistakes. A good focus on the relative strengths and weaknesses of both sides, militarily, economically and politically, especially in 1918, is expected. Candidates will need to be wide-ranging in their assessment of factors such as leadership (political, military), recruitment, logistics, administration, ideology, strategy and tactics; resources, geography, transport, War Communism and propaganda may well feature strongly. A comparative approach, drawing out contrasts, would work well here. Attention may be given to the roles of such Reds as Lenin and Trotsky, the Red Army, the Cheka and AGITPROP set against the lack of such figures, features, operational forces on the side of the Whites. Ideology, linked to propaganda (e.g. a patriotic war to defend the gains of the Revolution) may be regarded as important in providing the impetus to the Reds' success. Also, some awareness of and attention to the role of the Greens and peasant unrest would be helpful to the overall assessment. Given that the question runs to 1921, references to the major conflict between the Reds and the Greens (1920–21) would be in order; the extent of divisions of the Greens may be questioned in the context of the question.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. The question formulation opens up argument and counter-argument here, and there is debate here. Comparative analysis and evaluation should deliver a good level of answer. Candidates need to comment on the likely outcome – was it inevitable that the Reds would win? If so, how and why? Or was it only because of their opponents' problems and weaknesses? Did the Reds really possess superior qualities and resources? Were they lucky? What of Lenin's desire for a confrontation, a civil war?

AO3 [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not explicitly be penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	71

4 How far was a socialist revolution achieved in Russia by 1924?

[30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demand of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. A narrative, more likely description, of Bolshevik economic and social actions and policies will not really answer the question unless there is good explanation linked to the needs of the question. Some assessment of Bolshevik aims, perceived, conjectured or known, would assist evaluation. 'Revolution' is important, indeed central, here. Answers may well blend economy and society; that is acceptable, provided that recognisable features of each are engaged. There is plenty of material to consider here – though the political arena is not at issue and references there should be brief indeed. War Communism and the NEP. will be prominent features of assessment of economic changes; their context and content will be considered; the aftermath of the seizure of power, the actions of peasants and workers, nationalisation decrees and alterations in economic thinking and strategy either side of the Civil War will be important. Here, and in social areas, comparison and contrast between late 1917 and early 1924 will help evaluation. In social policy areas, reference could be made to: education, youth, women, religion, the class structure, peasants, workers (true proletariat?), leavening of society, extent of changes (attitudinal, structural), the re-alignment of elitism (party-based), the extent of mobility achieved (was the party the key vehicle?). Links to the economy could embrace living and working conditions, prices, wages (low, curbed), food prices (inflation), work hours, housing, health, nutrition (plenty died from starvation, etc).

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. The question formulation ('How far...') sets up argument and counter-argument; there is debate here. At core is the issue of the nature of the Bolshevik Revolution – was it a true revolution? How far was it driven by ideology? How far was it tempered by realism and pragmatism? Did Lenin pursue a true revolutionary ideology or did he actually betray the hopes of the October Revolution? Was there more social change than economic?

AO3 [Not applicable to Special subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not explicitly be penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.