



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

Mark scheme January 2004

GCE

History

Alternative F: Units 1 and 4

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**AS and A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners**

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's revised AS/A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specifications. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS and A2 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS/A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The revised specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the new specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for AS and A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives and across all the specifications offered by the Board.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B for AS and Section C for A2) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section D).

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS**Level 1:**

The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and indiscriminating with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

Level 2:***Either***

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant but outline only description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but limited grammatically.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

Level 5:

As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

C: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS

The relationship between the Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1.1, 1.2 and 2 and the Levels of Response.

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in AO1.1, by writing a narrative or descriptive response, will restrict themselves to a maximum of 6 out of 20 marks by performing at Level 1. Those candidates going on to provide more explanation (AO1.2), supported by the relevant selection of material (AO1.1), will have access to approximately 6 more marks, performing at Level 2 and low Level 3, depending on how implicit or partial their judgements prove to be. Candidates providing explanation with evaluation and judgement, supported by the selection of appropriate information and exemplification, will clearly be operating in all 3 AOs (AO2, AO1.2 and AO1.1) and will therefore have access to the highest levels and the full range of 20 marks by performing in Levels 3, 4 and 5.

Level 1:*Either*

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such answers will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics: they

- will lack direction and any clear links to the analytical demands of the question
- will, therefore, offer a relevant but outline-only description in response to the question
- will be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

- lack any significant corroboration
- be generalised and poorly focused
- demonstrate limited appreciation of specific content
- be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

IT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THIS TYPE OF RESPONSE AND THOSE WHICH ARE SUCCINCT AND UNDEVELOPED BUT FOCUSED AND VALID (appropriate for Level 2 or above).

Level 2:*Either*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

- understanding of some but not all of the issues
- some direction and focus demonstrated largely through introductions or conclusions
- some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of the language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

- arguments which have some focus and relevance
- an awareness of the specific context
- some accurate but limited factual support
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

- the approach will be generally analytical but may include some narrative passages which will be limited and controlled
- analysis will be focused and substantiated, although a complete balance of treatment of issues is not to be expected at this level nor is full supporting material
- there will be a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed, not fully convincing or which may occasionally digress into narrative
- there will be relevant supporting material, although not necessarily comprehensive, which might include reference to interpretations
- effective use of language, appropriate historical terminology and coherence of style.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope.

Exemplification/guidance

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

- sustained analysis, explicitly supported by relevant and accurate evidence
- little or no narrative, usually in the form of exemplification
- coverage of all the major issues, although there may not be balance of treatment
- an attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or summary
- effective skills of communication through the use of accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

Level 5:

As Level 4 but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 5 will be differentiated from Level 4 in that there will be:

- a consistently analytical approach
- consistent corroboration by reference to selected evidence
- a clear and consistent attempt to reach judgements
- some evidence of independence of thought, but not necessarily of originality
- a good conceptual understanding
- strong and effective communication skills, grammatically accurate and demonstrating coherence and clarity of thought.

D: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

These principles are applicable to both the Advanced Subsidiary examination and to the A level (A2) examination.

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: “What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?”. Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates’ responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid “bunching” of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills:**
generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
- well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid “double jeopardy”. Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

AS Unit 1: Tsarist and Revolutionary Russia 1855-1917**Question 1**

- (a) Use Source A and your own knowledge.

Explain briefly the significance of “wave of enthusiasm and patriotism” in the context of Russia’s situation in 1914. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. that the majority of Russians were enthusiastically patriotic on the outbreak of the war. **1**

- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. of the impact of events in 1914 on Russia. The Tsarist regime had had to regain stability after 1905. Although successful, there were renewed signs of dissatisfaction after 1912, for example the increased number of “political” strikes. The rallying of the nation behind the Tsar in 1914 offered more hope of stability and unity, until the disastrous impact of the war became felt. **2-3**

- (b) Use Sources A and C and your own knowledge.

Explain how Source C challenges the description of Russian unity in Source A. (7 marks)

Whilst candidates are expected to deploy own knowledge in assessing the degree to which the sources differ/the utility of the source, such deployment may well be implicit and it would be inappropriate to penalise full effective answers which do not explicitly contain ‘own knowledge’. The effectiveness of the comparison/assessment of utility, will be greater where it is clear that the candidates are aware of the context; indeed, in assessing utility, this will be very significant. It would be inappropriate, however, to expect direct and specific reference to ‘pieces’ of factual content.

Target: AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context, e.g. basic recognition that Source A implies widespread unity in Russia, whereas Source C implies considerable lack of unity across society. **1-2**

- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge, e.g. about unity in Russia showing a clear understanding that whatever disagreements there had been before 1914, the outbreak of war created an immediate fervour of patriotism and support for the government except amongst a few relatively small groups like the Bolsheviks; whereas by 1917, defeat, shortages and disillusionment had created a general feeling of dissatisfaction not just amongst revolutionary groups but amongst “respectable” elements that would normally have been expected to be supporters of the status quo. Answers which focus upon reliability will not be above this level. **3-5**

L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions. In addition to extracting the information from both sources as in Level 2, additionally explicitly applied own knowledge to emphasise the reasons for the differences outlined in the two sources. Before 1914 there was evidence of political and social discontent with the regime, as seen in the historiographical debate about how stable Russia was, there is little doubt that apart from relatively insignificant groups like the Bolsheviks, most of whose leaders were in exile anyway, the war brought about a temporary wave of patriotism and support, with the tsar drawing upon traditional reserves of support. In comparison, the various problems brought about by three years of war – military defeats, shortages, ministerial instability, scandal surrounding Rasputin and the royal family etc – created a growing feeling of disillusionment with the government. These feelings affected even traditional supporters of the regime or groups such as liberals who wanted reform but not revolution. Clearly even elements of the police and army, which had supported the regime in 1905, could no longer be trusted automatically to support the regime.

6-7

(c) Use Sources A, B and C and your own knowledge.

Explain the importance of the impact of the First World War within Russia, in relation to other factors, in bringing about the Russian Revolution of February/March 1917.

(15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations, which could apply to almost any time and/or place, based on *either* own knowledge *or* the sources. 1-4

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Or

Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant will lack both range and depth and contain some assertion. 5-8

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from source *and* own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. 9-11

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* own knowledge, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. 12-13

L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit and partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

Answers should show awareness of the range and extent of ways in which the War affected Russia's internal situation. The initial enthusiasm for the war soon faded as the difficulties of war mounted: there was disillusionment with Russia's military performance and the huge numbers of casualties which followed from defeats; there was the impact of growing shortages of essentials like food and fuel, especially as supplies to the cities were disrupted by military priorities; there was increasing dissatisfaction with the tsarist regime, and the influence of Rasputin and the tsarina; the tsar became tainted with defeat when he took over command of the army; there was growing opposition from within the Duma, for example with the emergence of the Progressive Bloc.

There is a debate about the extent to which radical political opposition such as that represented by the Bolsheviks was gaining ground at grass roots level, especially in the industrial centres. AS candidates cannot be expected to know this debate. The accepted wisdom is still that the Revolution was largely spontaneous in that there was no clear leadership, and that the disturbances which culminated in the February/March Revolution largely arose out of frustration, disillusionment and shortages rather than direct political action. It was the inability of the tsar to retain the support necessary to sustain himself in power and the fact that at the centre of events in Petrograd, the forces of law and order sided with the protestors, that caused the regime to collapse, creating a power vacuum that the Provisional Government filled.

Answers may legitimately focus on these shorter term factors, although some candidates may also develop longer term, more intangible factors such as growing dissatisfaction by the middle class at their lack of political importance and the dissatisfaction of many of the nobility at what it saw as the decline of its status. Some of these factors are present in the Sources, especially Source C, although the political difficulties are also clearly evident in Source B. The key question is, of course, were all these problems purely the result of an unsuccessful war, or would factors such as political frustration have been enough by themselves to have forced radical political change without the impact of war? The answer is probably no, given the apparent stability of the regime in 1914, but nevertheless there is a clear issue for debate.

Level 1 answers will be based upon unsupported generalisations, possibly with some description of events but with no serious analysis. Level 2 answers may provide more detail but will still tend towards a descriptive approach with little attempt at discussion. Level 3 answers will discuss some of the problems caused by war, but the answer may well not be balanced, concentrating narrowly on certain aspects. Higher level answers, Level 4, will include a good range of relevant material, and there will be a balanced explanation of the causes of the Revolution in relation to the experience of war. Level 5 answers will do this in a way which is consistently analytical and well substantiated.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “Soviets” in the context of the Revolution of October/November 1917. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. as organisations of workers, soldiers and sailors. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the soviets’ role before the October/November Revolution. There may be reference to the political arguments and the fact that the Bolsheviks won majorities in the soviets, encouraging Lenin to use them as a base for an attack on the Government. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why the Provisional Government had lost much of its support in Russia by October 1917. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue or event through general and unsupported statements. There will be understanding of why the Provisional Government lost support, for example, the fact that it was “temporary” or its continuation of the war. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material. e.g. loss of support for the Government: factors such as military defeats, failure to carry out land reform or call elections; the growth of organised opposition such as the Bolsheviks or Kornilov. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance. An answer might signify an attempt to prioritise the reasons, make links or draw conclusions about their relative significance or explain them well in context. A good answer might well consider the extent to which the Government’s loss of support was due to its own policies, for example, failure to end the war or carry out land reform; and to what extent it was due to factors outside its control, such as the activities of the soviets and revolutionary groups and the difficulties of governing without authority and in an inherently unstable situation caused by three years of unsuccessful war. **6-7**

- (d) “The role of Lenin was the most important factor in ensuring the success of the Bolsheviks in 1917.” Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement.
(15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

Lenin clearly played a major role in the events of 1917. Until his return to Russia in April, the Bolsheviks were mostly co-operating with the Provisional Government. Lenin’s April Theses, although not universally accepted by his colleagues at first, were a clear statement of opposition to the Government and a declaration of his belief that the Bolsheviks should work immediately for a second, socialist revolution rather than wait for events to take their course. Lenin’s leadership was crucial: by keeping the Bolsheviks out of the Government, he avoided tainting them with the impact of defeat and continuing problems. Despite the setback of the July Days, Lenin, along with Trotsky, worked unstintingly towards a coup, and was able to overcome opposition from leading colleagues who felt that the time was not ripe. Lenin was a master of tactics, and used the soviets as a springboard for action. He had a clear perception of how to seize the moment in a state of political vacuum. There were other factors which explain the Bolshevik success: Trotsky’s dynamism and organisation; the impact of the Kornilov Revolt, the failure of the authority and policies of the Provisional Government. But it still required someone to seize the opportunity decisively, which is what Lenin did.

A Level 1 answer will be very generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than unsubstantiated assertion that Lenin was important. At Level 2, answers will demonstrate by relevant selection of material some of Lenin's significance, but the answer may lack weight or balance. Higher level answers, Level 4, will consider the relative importance of various factors. Level 5 answers will do this in a way which is consistently analytical and well substantiated.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “weak economic base” in the context of Russian economic development in the fifty years after the accession of Alexander II in 1855. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract. Basic reference to the fact that the Russian economy was largely rural based and undeveloped by the standards of more advanced economies. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context. There had been limited industrial development in Russia up to this point. There were few centres of industry, and the economy was largely based on small-scale agriculture. There was limited opportunities for expansion: for example, a limited supply of credit available for investment. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Russian Governments promoted industrial change in late nineteenth century Russia. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue or event through general and unsupported statements. There is basic understanding that industrial developments did occur at this time, although they were limited in scope. There will be little understanding of specific motives. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material. Answers will probably show some understanding of the motives of Witte, in particular, in wanting to boost Russian industry to provide a more secure basis for Russia’s great power status. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance. Answers will show a clear understanding of the motives for industrial expansion. There may well be awareness of the tradition of state sponsorship of industry going back to Peter the Great; and knowledge of the specific reasons for industrial expansion in the nineteenth century, including awareness following Russia’s defeat in the Crimean War that if Russia were to maintain its great power ranking, a predominantly agricultural economy had to be modified – hence the policies of ministers such as Witte. **6-7**

- (c) “In the years 1881 to 1914, the process of industrialisation created forces which threatened the survival of the tsarist regime.”

Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

The process of industrialisation involved, amongst other things, the development of industrial concentrations in cities like St Petersburg and Moscow, with large numbers of workers living in squalid conditions – although some of these retained a peasant mentality, and indeed sometimes migrated between city and countryside. Industrialisation also involved processes such as foreign investment in Russia and large debts. These forces certainly encouraged the Social Democrats, who claimed to represent the interests of the urban working class and were bent on a socialist revolution. The industrial development also led Lenin and others to develop their theories of monopoly capitalism. The threat to tsarism is less clear: much of the discontent at this time came from the countryside, where there was growing pressure on the land from an expanding peasant base, which would have occurred without industrialisation. The Revolution was crushed, and although in later years there were industrial strikes, sometimes with political undertones, there was little evidence by 1914 that Russia’s limited industrialisation was an immediate threat to the survival of the regime. The regime was conscious of a potential threat, but the largest revolutionary group was the SRs, a peasant-based party, and most of the SPD leaders were in exile.

A Level 1 answer will be very generalised and indiscriminating, either containing some factual material on industrialisation or opposition forces to Tsarism, but based on unsubstantiated assertion. At Level 2 answers will make some relevant selection of material showing some understanding of the “forces” which developed as part of industrialisation, especially the creation of an urban working class. A Level 3 answer will include the range of material in a Level 2 answer, but the selection or commentary will show a link between industrialisation and potentially anti-tsarist forces, although the answer may lack weight or balance. Higher level answers, Level 4, will develop a perspective as to whether industrialisation was a seriously damaging force for the continuation of the tsarist regime. Level 5 answers will do this in a way which is consistently analytical and well substantiated.

A2 Unit 4: Russia and the USSR, 1881-1985**Question 1**

- (a) Use Source C and your own knowledge.

Explain what is meant by “planning methods” in the context of Soviet industrial production. (5 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Basic definition with limited exemplification. The key feature of the Soviet economy from 1928 was that it was planned. **1**

- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the concept with supporting detail drawn either from the source and/or from own knowledge. The Five Year Plan was the controlling mechanism of the economy. Key features included the premium put on fulfilling quantitative targets rather than quality control; and the emphasis, particularly early on, on investment in heavy industry. Source C highlights the fact that there was limited autonomy and initiative possible, especially in the early years, because of the emphasis on centralised planning. **2-3**

- L3: As L2, with developed reference to both the source and own knowledge, e.g. emphasising the fact that the Five Year Plans had been introduced for a specific reason i.e. to boost Soviet industrial production rapidly, but after 1945 were proving an increasingly clumsy and inefficient mechanism for meeting the needs of a more sophisticated economy. A top level answer may well distinguish between different periods, e.g. in the early 1930s the emphasis had all been on heavy industry at the expense of consumer goods; later in the 1930s the defence industry featured more; after 1945 the emphasis was on reconstruction. Later there was more attention paid to consumer goods and attempts to introduce more flexibility, by methods such as bonuses and encouraging more managerial initiative – although the fundamentals of planning remained in place. **4-5**

- (b) Use Source D and your own knowledge.

How useful is Source D in explaining problems in the Soviet economic system in the years 1971 to 1985? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Identifies/extracts simple statements from the sources which demonstrate agreement/disagreement on the issue. **1-2**

- L2: Demonstrates explicit understanding of utility/sufficiency etc. with reference to the sources and knowledge of the issue. **3-5**

- L3: Draws conclusions about utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue, with reference to both sources and to own knowledge. **6-8**

- L4: Uses material selected appropriately from both source and own knowledge to reach a sustained judgement on utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue. **9-10**

Indicative content

Both the official and unofficial statistics show a decline in two key economic indicators, the growth rate of national income and the decline in labour productivity. Level 1 or low Level 2 answers may well take the sources at face value and not evaluate them in any meaningful sense. Level 3 answers will evaluate the source in more depth, using the source and own knowledge. Such answers may explain that the “unofficial” statistics present the more damning picture. The decline in the growth in national income during the period after 1971 was due to several factors: the inefficiencies of central planning and lack of flexibility in the economy; continuing problems of agricultural production; the cost of increasing military expenditure after the Khrushchev period; the failure of reforms, notably Khrushchev’s; the inability before 1985 to agree on any fundamental changes to the system. Labour productivity suffered from similar problems, compounded by the fact that the economy was labour-intensive; there was a shortage of labour in many areas; peasants and workers lacked incentives or often the means to raise productivity; there were social problems resulting in huge absenteeism etc.

In addition to bringing own knowledge to bear, candidates should comment specifically on the utility of this source: they may well question the reliability of the source. How accurate are the figures? How do we account for the differences between the two sets of figures? What do the sources not tell us? The sources only relate to certain years; they do not distinguish between more efficient sectors of the economy such as defence production, which were given priority and the necessary resources, and the more efficient staple industries; the source gives no indication of the underlying economic debate which culminated in Gorbachev and perestroika. Answers which focus exclusively on reliability or “value by content” are unlikely to achieve beyond Level 2. Level 4 answers are likely to address the issues above but include a sustained judgement on utility, with a perspective on the whole period 1971-85.

- (c) Use Sources A, B, C and D, and your own knowledge.

Assess the extent to which tsarist and Soviet governments succeeded in meeting the needs of the Russian and Soviet economies in the period 1881-1985. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-4**

- L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **5-8**

- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **14-15**

Indicative content

This is a synoptic question and candidates' responses should be rewarded for referring to aspects of change and continuity over a period of at least 100 years, as detailed in the specification for this particular Alternative, and to an appropriate range of factors as exemplified by the indicative content for each particular question.

The focus of the question is on long term continuity and change. The Russian economy faced several problems in the 1880s. Agriculture had not benefited much from the emancipation of the serfs and a growing population was putting pressure on farming. Productivity was low. Serious industrialisation was just beginning. Witte's policy of industrialisation had some successes, for example in railway construction, although the economy was heavily dependent on foreign investment, and there were periodic periods of boom and recession before 1914. The success of Stolypin's efforts to reform landownership remains a subject of debate. Following World War One, the economy went through a period of crisis and disruption, made worse by War Communism. The introduction of NEP helped to raise the level of industry, but agriculture remained backward and Russia was not yet an industrialised society. Stalin's economic revolution had mixed results: collectivism secured grain supplies for the state but did not markedly improve overall output or efficiency.

Industrialisation, through relatively crude planning and mass mobilisation, successfully gave Russia an industrial base, but a enormous economic and human cost. The USSR did survive World War Two and recovered from the devastation. Problems persisted. Despite the tinkering of Khrushchev, agricultural production remained a problem and the economy proved increasingly unresponsive to the planning system, especially as the USSR attempted to maintain its superpower status. The period from the 1960s to the 1980s was one largely of stagnation, with little done to solve the problems of a top-heavy, inefficient economic system, and the economy was actually in decline by the 1980s.

There is no requirement to give equal treatment to agriculture and industry. Answers which simply narrate events, without real analysis, will be Level 1. Limited analysis will reach Level 2, but only where there is some judgement and explicit addressing of the issue will Level 3 be reached. Answers which include elements of continuity and change, using own knowledge and information from the sources, will be in Level 4 or 5 providing they cover a significant part of the period and address the issues of “success” and the “extent to which”. Level 5 answers will consistently analytical and well substantiated.

Section B

These questions are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidates' responses should be clearly linked to the range of factors or issues covered in the question as indicated by the generic A2 level of response mark scheme and by the indicative content in each specific mark scheme for each question.

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2 (without reference to sources)**L1: *Either***

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis, but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such responses will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply almost to any time and/or place. **1-6**

L2: *Either*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, implicit understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **7-11**

L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Question 2

How valid is the argument that, by 1941, collectivisation had proved to be a political success but an economic disaster? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Collectivisation was a human tragedy in terms of the dislocation to peoples lives, and the millions of lives lost in the process. The question of its success or disaster in economic and political terms is more complex. In several respects it was an economic disaster: the widespread slaughter of livestock during collectivisation and the disruption to grain farming led to drastic falls in production which were not restored until the later 1930s; there was terrible famine in the early 1930s, and food shortages. On the other hand, starvation in the cities was averted, and the Government succeeded in supplying food to the towns to feed industrial workers, which was essential to the success of industrialisation, the regime's main objective. Therefore whilst an economic disaster for many farmers, especially kulaks, the question is less straightforward for the Government. Similarly, it might be argued that to alienate millions of peasants was bad politics on the part of the regime. On the other hand, as the result of amalgamating lots of farms into Party-controlled collectives, the Communist regime had secured control of the countryside for the first time since the Revolution. Once the peasant resistance had been broken, the regime never faced a serious internal threat again until the late 1980s. The regime was able to export grain to pay for goods, was able to control the countryside, abolished the kulak class (a political aim), had secured extra workers for the industrialisation drive, and was able to feed the urban work force. All these might be regarded as political successes for Stalin, who also secured his own political power, albeit at enormous human and economic cost. Without collectivisation there would have been no industrialisation; without industrialisation there would have been no victory against Germany in 1945.

Level 1 answers will be assertions or a narrative of the events of collectivisation. Level 2 answers will be mainly descriptive or with some analysis, but cover only certain aspects, such as describing the economic effects of collectivisation: for example, the chaos resulting from the initial process, leading to drastic disruption of production, and famine in the Ukraine. Level 3 answers will include a reasonable amount of this material, and may well touch upon political aspects also, by considering the extent to which the collectivisation drive succeeded in meeting its objectives. However, the answer may well lack weight or balance, and the judgement about "success" or "disaster" may well be implicit or partial.

Higher level answers, Level 4, will include a good range of material, and there will be explicit judgement as to whether the result was a political success and economic disaster or not. Although it is not a requirement, some answers may go further in discussing interpretations and will show perspective, probably clearly linking political and economic factors and evaluating the period as a whole. Level 5 answers will be consistently analytical and well substantiated.

Question 3

How valid is the argument that the USSR achieved victory over Germany in spite of Stalin, not as a result of his leadership? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

There have been many criticisms of Stalin's leadership before and during the war. As a result of the purges, the stifling of initiative and Stalin's concern with defence and anxiety not to provoke Hitler, the USSR was not well prepared for war in 1939. On the other hand, army reforms were carried out in the last few months of peace, there was an emphasis on defence production, and efforts were made to build defence industries in the more secure East. Once the war started, Stalin appeared to lose his nerve, and there were major Soviet disasters. The halting of the German advance owed more to German errors, the weather, and the heroism and hard work of ordinary Russian soldiers and civilians than to Stalin. Yet Stalin stayed in command, learned to exploit Russian patriotism rather than rely on Communist propaganda, and he learned to appoint and trust good commanders like Zhukov. The Soviet command system was far more efficient than the German one, and the wartime siege economy produced the goods. If there is to be an adverse criticism of Stalin's policies at the start of the war, he also deserves some credit for the USSR's eventual success.

Level 1 answers will be assertions or a narrative of the Soviet experience in World War Two. Level 2 will be mainly descriptive or with some analysis, but covering limited aspects. Level 3 answers will include a reasonable amount of material, but the judgement will be implicit or partial and the answer will lack weight or balance. Higher level answers, Level 4, will contain a good range of material and there will be explicit judgement. Although not a requirement, some answers will go further in discussing interpretations and show a good grasp of perspective in considering exactly why the USSR won the war and Stalin's role in all this. Level 5 answers will be consistently analytical and well substantiated.

Question 4

“It was his reckless economic and political policies which brought him down.” How valid is this explanation of Khrushchev’s fall from power in 1964? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Khrushchev fell from power for various reasons. He was regarded as having mismanaged the Cuban missile crisis and having damaged Soviet credibility and prestige. He upset many in the Party over his proposed political and economic reforms, several of which such as the Virgin Lands scheme failed, as well as his Destalinisation activities. There was dissatisfaction in some quarters at what was seen as his populist, crude leadership style. He was widely regarded as reckless and adventurous. He failed to keep enough support among leading party colleagues, despite his success in manoeuvring himself into power. Although powerful, Khrushchev never commanded the Party in the way that Stalin had done. Although Khrushchev had no intention of fundamentally altering the Soviet system that had produced him, he opened cans of worms and persuaded many party careerists and idealists that he was a threat to themselves and the system which they served.

Level 1 answers will be assertions or a narrative of Khrushchev’s career or dismissal. Level 2 answers will be mainly descriptive or with some analysis but covering only certain aspects. Answers may deal with only political or economic aspects. Level 3 answers will contain a reasonable amount of material, but only certain aspects will be covered, the judgement may be only implicit or partial, and the answer will lack weight or balance. Higher level answers, Level 4, will include a good range of material, covering both political and economic aspects, and there will be an explicit judgement. It is not a requirement, but some answers may go further in discussing interpretations – was Khrushchev dismissed because he was a failure, or did he upset too many people? There may be a good sense of perspective, e.g. possibly comparing Khrushchev’s experience with that of other Soviet leaders. Level 5 answers will be consistently analytical and well substantiated.