

GCE 2005
January Series



Mark Scheme

History Alternative F Units 1 and 4 *(Subject Code 5041/6041)*

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website:
www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2005 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester. M15 6EX.

Dr Michael Cresswell Director General

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 undiscriminating 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 undiscriminating 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.

January 2005**Alternative F: Russia and the USSR, 1855-1991****AS Unit 1: Tsarist and Revolutionary Russia, 1855-1917****Question 1**

- (a) Use **Source B** and your own knowledge.

Explain briefly the importance of “serfdom” in the context of Russian society before 1861. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. shows a basic awareness of serfdom as the cornerstone of Russia’s rural economy and society. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. shows an understanding of the importance of serfdom both as the mainstay of Russia’s economy and society but also the implications which arose from this – for example the system of conscription into the army; the fact that serfdom discouraged innovation and agricultural development; the fact that dissatisfaction with the system was a source of concern to the Government and was a driving force behind eventual reform. **2-3**

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

With reference to the reforms of Alexander II, explain how the views in **Source A** differ from the views put forward in **Source B**. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

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 and 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.

- L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context, e.g. both Source A and Source B are critical of Alexander II’s emancipation, although Source A is entirely negative and dismissive, whereas Source B at least acknowledges that emancipation has had some positive impact in abolishing serfdom, although many problems remain. **1-2**

- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge, e.g. Source A is clearly totally dismissive of emancipation because the revolutionaries who wrote the manifesto would be opposed not just to the institution of serfdom, but the whole basis of society and the autocracy as evident from the radical demands such as the abolition of the nobility. They appear to be advocating a form of peasant socialism, based on communal land ownership. This manifesto represents the views of those who were likely to be dismissive of any of Alexander's reforms, since these did not alter the fundamental basis of society. In contrast Source B comes from a group of people who would be expected to be more conservative, given that they represent the interests of the landed classes. **3-5**
- L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. the answer will probably recognise that Source B is not entirely reactionary: the assembly after all does advocate further reforms. However, demands, for example emphasising the need for better relations between peasants and nobles, are based on the supposition that the existing order of society should be preserved, unlike the more radical approach of Source A. Nevertheless the fact that the Assembly is calling for further reform such as more election to government service shows that even the nobility was not content with Alexander's government. Therefore there are both similarities and differences between the two sources both in terms of content and provenance. **6-7**

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

How important, in relation to other factors, were the reforms of Alexander II in securing the stability of the tsarist regime until the accession of Nicholas II in 1894?
(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 *either* on 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* from 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 the sources *and* from 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* from 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

The sources would indicate that the emancipation of 1861, the theme of Sources A and B, whilst implementing what was widely seen as a necessary change to the social and economic order in order to prevent a “revolution from below”, caused considerable dissatisfaction to members of all classes, both radical and conservative. As such, emancipation was unlikely to contribute to long-term stability, although it might be argued that without emancipation, there might have been widespread social discontent anyway. Source C develops the impact of Alexander II, reforms, emphasising their limitations and the fact that they had a limited impact on the political and social order. Alexander carried out several other important reforms affecting local government, the army, education and justice. These reforms were significant, although they did not fundamentally alter the basis of society, and the reforms dried up in the later 1860s when Alexander entered his “conservative” phase. Alexander III, in response to his father’s assassination and his own inclinations, was reactionary in approach and further modified Alexander II’s reforms. This further stimulated radical groups such as the Populists, “Land and Liberty” and other terrorist groups, in direct opposition to the regime. The regime took opposition very seriously, and methods such as the secret police and censorship kept the regime reasonably secure despite the assassination of Alexander II. There was evidence of discontent, for example peasant dissatisfaction stimulated by land hunger and periodic famine, but there was also a long tradition of support for the regime, and it would be difficult to argue that specific reforms were a major factor in affecting attitudes, especially since some of the reforms had been modified by 1894.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to focus on a limited account of the reforms. At Level 2 there will be a greater range and selectivity in use of evidence and some attempt to relate it to the issue of stability. Level 3 responses will have greater accuracy, range and depth and will make some specific links between the reforms and stability. At Level 4 the links will be argued more convincingly and there will be a good coverage of the reigns of both Alexander II and III. Level 5 answers will probably cross reference sources and own knowledge effectively and draw clear conclusions about the issue of reform and stability.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “some modifications of tsarist authority” in the context of Russia between 1905 and 1914. **(3 marks)**

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. recognising that there had been some change in the nature of the regime after 1905. **1**

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. briefly explaining the limited changes to tsarist authority made between the 1905 Revolution and the outbreak of WW1. There may be reference to the October Manifesto and reform, but most likely there will be reference to the dumas. However, answers at the top of the Level are likely to be those which recognise that the modifications to the autocratic nature of tsarism were limited. **2-3**

(b) Explain why the tsarist regime carried out economic reform between 1894 and 1914. **(7 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. a general recognition that the 1905 Revolution had been a shock to the regime, and prompted some change. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. answers are likely to explain the context of the 1905 Revolution and the way in which it prompted the regime into limited reform as well as repression. Answers may well focus on Stolypin's agrarian reforms, designed not just to improve efficiency but above all to create a conservative, loyal peasantry. However, material from the pre-1905 period should also be credited, for example a continuation of Witte's economic strategy designed to encourage investment and develop industry. **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, e.g. the answer may make explicit links between the impact of 1905 and the nature of the concessions made, and the answer is likely to evaluate exactly how significant the concessions actually were. For example, Stolypin's agrarian reforms were significant, but their precise rationale is open to debate, since their purpose was as much political as economic. **6-7**

(c) "By 1914, the tsarist regime was as unstable as at any time since the accession of Nicholas II in 1894."
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 of the 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

Answers should take an overview of the period of Nicholas II's reign, with a specific focus on the issue of stability, relating to the 1905 Revolution and developments to the outbreak of war in 1914. There may be a discussion of 1905 and the causes of the revolution, including the defeat in war against Japan, although better answers may well focus on the disparate events which made up 1905, rather than seeing it as an organised coup against the regime. There will be reference to the Government's strategy for surviving the Revolution, including the October Manifesto, dividing and then crushing opposition, and tactics such as the Fundamental Laws. There will also be an account of developments such as those covered in part (b), particularly the era of the dumas and reform, focusing on Stolypin's strategy of reform combined with repression. The regime survived, partly because it had the forces of law and order on its side, and could still count on reserves of loyalty. There are arguments about the stability of the regime after 1912. There were outbursts of discontent exemplified by the Lena Goldfields Massacre and the increased number of strikes, and there was dissatisfaction not just from revolutionaries but from liberals wanting constitutional government and some say in the political process. However, there was some economic progress, despite blips as Russia industrialised. There was some agricultural reform, although the impact of Stolypin's measures should not be exaggerated. There was no widespread evidence of overt dissent, despite disquiet at factors such as the growing influence of Rasputin, and indeed at the outbreak of war, the tsar benefited from an upsurge in patriotic support.

Answers at Level 1 will be brief and be made up of generalised description. At Level 2 answers will also be predominantly descriptive of events, and will not really address the issue of stability. At Level 3 answers will identify several factors from the 1905-14 period, probably with some comment on stability, but this will not be well developed or very balanced. At Level 4 there will be supporting evidence but also a broad and balanced analysis. Additionally, at Level 5, there will be conclusions about the issue of stability soundly based on the detailed evidence provided.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “autocratic monarchy” in the context of Russian government at the beginning of 1917. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. Russian autocracy meant the Tsar was all powerful. **1**

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. describing the autocratic/absolutist nature of the tsarist monarchy as it existed under Nicholas II. Well developed answers may well refer to the existence of the Dumas and any restrictions imposed on Nicholas II’s freedom of action by factors such as the War, the influence of the tsarina etc, whilst recognising that in essence the monarch was still absolutist. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why discontent with the tsarist regime had grown in Russia between 1914 and 1917. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Russia failed in the First World War. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. explaining the various reasons for discontent with the regime. Some of these might be long term in the sense that there had always been some Russians, both liberals and radicals/revolutionaries, opposed to aspects of tsarist rule or tsarism as such. However, after initial enthusiasm for the war in 1914, discontent had steadily grown until there was little support for the regime by 1917. Reasons include: discontent caused by Russia’s military performance; the problems at home such as shortages of fuel and food, and inflation, also directly attributable to the war; criticism of the Tsar’s role as commander-in-chief; dissatisfaction with the role of the tsarina and Rasputin; deteriorating relations between the tsar and the duma; weak government, exemplified by frequent changes of ministers. **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, e.g. as L2, but possibly for example distinguishing between those factors directly to Nicholas II’s personality and style of government, and those factors which developed as the result of a disastrous war. **6-7**

- (c) “Despite widespread discontent in Russia by February 1917, the revolution of that month still took everyone, including the revolutionaries, by surprise.”
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 of the 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

Answers should focus both upon the immediate and longer term causes of the February/March Revolution, and also the events themselves. There is some overlap with part (b) in the sense that the reasons for discontent in Russia were varied: disquiet caused by military defeat and casualties, problems on the home front, increasing dissatisfaction with the Tsar and his method of government. There was a general feeling by 1917 that things could not go on as they were, but the tsar, under the influence of his wife, showed little inclination to change. There were groups of revolutionaries who had long been totally opposed to the regime and all it stood for. However, many of the leaders (such as Lenin and Trotsky for the Bolsheviks), were in exile. There is a debate about the extent to which revolutionary influence in the workplace was of growing significance, but there is general acceptance that revolutionary influence was not a major factor in 1917. Liberals and groups within the duma certainly wanted change, but not a destruction of the whole system. There was general dissatisfaction, and increasingly there was little inclination to support the tsar, but organised opposition was small, and whilst groups such as the peasants had specific grievances such as land, few people were looking ahead to a specific change in government. That is why when the revolution occurred, although it was not unexpected, it did not follow any particular plan. Events in Petrograd turned ugly following hunger demonstrations and strikes, but only became serious when (unlike 1905) the forces of law and order sided with the demonstrators. The tsar, away at the front, only abdicated when he realised that he had too little support left.

The “surprise” element of the revolution was evident in the fact that there was nobody to take control until the self-constituted Provisional Government came into existence, and revolutionary leaders like Lenin were themselves taken by surprise at the course of events.

Answers at Level 1 will be brief and generalised, probably with some general narrative or description of events. Level 2 answers will also be mainly descriptive, and there will be little or no attempt to deal with the “surprise” aspect. At Level 3 there will be some focus both on the reasons for discontent and the surprise nature of the revolution, although the focus may well be unbalanced. At Level 4 the analysis will be balanced and broad. Level 5 answers will be similarly well developed, but additionally will draw conclusions securely based on the detailed evidence provided.

January 2005**Alternative F: Russia and the USSR, 1855-1991****A2 Unit 4: Russia and the USSR, 1881-1985****Question 1**

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

How fully do **Sources B** and **C** explain the importance which the Soviet regime attached to strong links between agriculture and industry? (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

The sources refer to links between agriculture and industry, e.g. Source B refers to the importance of peasants being able to buy manufactured goods if they are to support Government policy. In Source B Lenin recognises the importance of having the support of both workers and peasants and establishing good relations between them – and this will be best achieved by workers producing goods which the peasants will want to buy, and in return the peasants will supply surplus food to the workforce – and benefiting the economy as a whole. Stalin emphasises the link in a different way in Source C. Producing grain is seen as necessary since exports are necessary to purchase the industrial equipment needed by the USSR and food has to be provided for towns if the industrialisation programme is to succeed. Answers may recognise the context of Source B: Lenin has recently introduced NEP to end a difficult period in which both workers and especially peasants had been alienated by the harshness of War Communism. It was less a case of ensuring a flourishing economy at this time than of appeasing the workers and peasants in order to secure the Communist regime and learn from shocks such as the Kronstadt Revolt. The situation described by Source C is different: Stalin had just secured his personal power, collectivisation and industrialisation were under way, and the emphasis of economic policy was not less on immediate survival than on creating a powerful economy. This necessitated good links between the country and the towns: the industrial workforce had to be fed, and collective farmers were to supply the grain for it and for export. Peasants could also reinforce the massively increased urban workforce. Strong links would also make it easier for the regime to exert political control in

the countryside, and area in which it had previously been weak. Of course both sources only relate to a particular period of Soviet history: the period of NEP and the earlier stages of collectivisation/industrialisation. Answers will certainly acknowledge that the sources present only part of the picture, although they will make developed links between them. Candidates may query the provenance of Source B, although there is no reason to doubt that Lenin was being candid here, particularly since he is acknowledging his regime's mistakes. The links between industry and agriculture remained important throughout the Soviet period, not just the years covered by these two sources. The perceived "second class" status of agriculture compared to industry remained a problem throughout the Soviet period, and arguably helped along with industrial problems to hold back economic progress generally after the initial success of the Five Year Plans.

Level 1 answers will probably just summarise Sources B and C or quote from them (e.g. Source B refers to the benefits of "popular relations" between manufactured goods and peasant produce; Source C refers to using farm produce to pay for industrial equipment), but make no valid commentary. At Level 2 the issue of "How fully" will be at least partly addressed. Source B clearly establishes Lenin's belief that peasants are more likely to accept Government policy if they see the benefits to them of being able to acquire manufactured goods; Source C explains why the state needed to sell agricultural produce to purchase necessary industrial equipment. However, the commentary at this level may still focus on "value by content" i.e. this is what the sources tell us and therefore they must be useful. Once into Level 3, the answer will be drawing legitimate conclusions, e.g. Lenin's comments are useful in explaining why he felt that good relations with the peasants were important, but Source B does not indicate the dire consequences of War Communism which led to Lenin's change of attitude. Source C is useful in summarising important aspects of Stalin's economic policy, but does not really explain the essence of Soviet industrialisation which relied upon the rural economy to provide food for the towns and a source of labour for the new factories. Candidates' own knowledge should develop these points. At Level 4, candidates will develop the links between agriculture and industry, using the sources and own knowledge, with a sustained and relevant argument, probably showing a good awareness of content, e.g. the fact that before the 1930s, the Communist regime did not have a secure hold over the countryside.

(b) Use **Sources A, B, C and D** and your own knowledge.

"Tsarist and Soviet governments were successful in managing agricultural improvement in the years between 1881 and 1985."

Assess the validity of this statement.

(20 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. **1-6**

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. **7-11**

- 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. **12-15**
- 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. **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**

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 sources suggest that Russian and Soviet governments had difficulties in managing agriculture. Source A states that the tsarist economy was still based on agriculture, but agriculture was not efficient because of the system of land ownership and the lack of incentive for peasants. Source B implies that there had been major problems in agricultural management, caused partly by an inability to produce sufficient goods to motivate peasants, and the fact that peasants who were not in the Party lacked conviction in the regime. Source C also implies that there had been problems in that there are references to Stalin feeling it necessary to introduce dictatorial methods, since "economic" methods were not working. But the methods created "pressure" and peasants were "alienated", suggesting that all was not well at least from the peasant point of view. Source D claims that there had been agricultural advances since 1965, particularly in output, but problems remained, with references to "exhaustion", "confusion" and a failure to take local conditions into account when determining policy.

Own knowledge should help to explain and amplify these sources. Agriculture before 1914 suffered from problems such as backwardness, land hunger in the context of a rising population, and shortages sometimes resulting in famine. Arguably before 1906 the Government did insufficient to manage improvement: emancipation did not significantly boost production, and the emphasis of Witte's strategy was to develop industry, with agriculture playing very much a supporting role. Stolypin did pay attention to agricultural improvement, with measures such as a land bank, the abolition of redemption payments and the encouragement for peasants to consolidate their farms. However, the overall effect of these measures was limited. After the Revolution the country was in chaos, and the requisitioning under War Communism was a major disincentive for peasants to produce. NEP along with the end of Civil War certainly gave a boost to production and arguably this

was a period when the regime did manage agricultural improvement successfully. However, many Communists disliked the capitalist elements of NEP and the shortage of supplies from the countryside in the late 1920s determined Stalin to commit to collectivisation, which he saw as a necessary adjunct to industrialisation as well as ensuring Party control of the countryside for the first time. The chaos of collectivisation had a very bad effect on production as well as enormous human cost; however, it could be argued that the policy was a political and economic success for Stalin to the extent that the draconian methods did provide supplies of food for the industrial towns as well as for export. After World War 2 agriculture continued to be the poor handmaiden of industry. Collectivisation was reimposed and production figures were still disappointing. Khrushchev paid more attention to agriculture and tried to secure improvement by giving more power to local administrators as opposed to centralised decision making, by giving farms the freedom to buy machinery, abolishing dependence on MTS stations, abolishing compulsory deliveries to the state from private plots, and improving the living standards of peasants. These measures were only partially successful, and the Virgin Lands experiment was ultimately a failure. There was also only limited success under Brezhnev. The principal focus was still on heavy industry and defence. Many peasants still lived in poverty and lacked incentive. Poor harvests meant that grain imports were necessary. Therefore despite some increased investment in agriculture, it was evident that agricultural improvement was not well managed, as reformers like Gorbachev openly admitted.

Level 1 answers are likely to be based on unsupported general assertions, or may be narrow and assertive. Level 2 answers will contain some relevant material but may well be very unbalanced in their coverage of the whole period. At Level 3 there should be some focus on issues of continuity and/or change across the period, as well as some focus on the actual issue of managing improvement. At Level 4 there is likely to be fuller treatment of the whole period and there will be a strong emphasis on the way in which governments handled agriculture. Level 5 answers will be more sustained in their judgement and use of supporting evidence, and they may well show a good perspective of the 100 year period.

Section B

Question 2 onward

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 levels of response mark scheme and by the indicative content in the specific mark scheme for each question.

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

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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 to almost 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

To what extent, economically and socially, was the USSR strengthened by the Five-Year Plans between 1929 and 1941? **(20 marks)**

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

Candidates will probably find more to write about on the economic impact of the five year plans than the social impact, but both aspects should be covered, although not necessarily to the same extent. The question is not about Stalin's motives or the organisation of the plans, although aspects of these could be made relevant. Material on agriculture and collectivisation should not be credited at the higher levels unless specifically related to planning and overall economic performance.

The precise economic impact of the three plans is open to debate. There is no doubt that there were considerable advances in output of certain key heavy industries, although not all targets were met; priorities did change during the implementation, and actual figures will

vary according to which sources have been read. Broadly the First Plan laid down some of the basic structure, the Second Plan had somewhat more realistic targets, and was more balanced in that it gave more attention to light industry and consumer goods, and the interrupted Third Plan gave considerable priority to defence. There were many deficiencies in the planning, and quantity ruled at the expense of quality. Many of the advances were due to the massive efforts made by ordinary workers, including large numbers of women, and a convict labour force and displaced peasants, rather than being the result of sophisticated production techniques. There were mistakes but also great achievements such as the giant h.e.p projects. It might be argued that the USSR was strengthened in that the defence industry was created and the building of much industry deep inside the USSR ultimately saved the USSR and was responsible for its victory in WW2. On the other hand, the stresses and strains created by the strict labour discipline, the negative impact on agriculture, the impact of the Terror, were also immense. Overall the USSR did industrialise in a short space of time, although the methods were crude and the human costs were immense. This point should be developed for the social impact. It might be argued that the shortage of consumer goods, the strict labour discipline and the atmosphere of fear created great social stresses. On the other hand there was no unemployment and propaganda extolled the notion of togetherness in the cause of building socialism, even if it meant a siege mentality. There were developments in educations and changes in social policy which, it might be argued, would not have occurred without the accompanying industrialisation and urbanisation.

At Level 1 answers are likely to rely on generalised assertions, supported by uncritical evidence or description, with little attempt to address the issue of “strengthening”. At Level 2 there will be some relevant information on the ways in which the Five-Year Plans boosted economic performance, e.g. the massive increases in industrial output, but there will be little or no commentary on the “strengthening” aspect. To reach Level 3, or above, answers should certainly address both the economic and social impact, although equal treatment is not expected. There should also be some attempt to address the specific question of the impact on the USSR. A Level 4 answer should be reasonably wide ranging, answer the specific question and produce a range of supporting evidence. Level 5 answers should have a substantiated judgement, well supported throughout. There may also be a good sense of long-term perspective.

Question 3

How valid is the judgement that “economic strength was more important than Stalin’s leadership in explaining the Soviet Victory in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945”?
(20 marks)

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

The Soviet victory in the War can be attributed to a variety of factors: the heroism of the ordinary Soviet soldiers and civilians; the firm leadership of Stalin after initial mistakes; the

strategic and tactical mistakes made by the invading Germans; the support which the Allies provided for the USSR; the productive capacity of the USSR; and so on. This question has a particular focus upon economic strength and Stalin's leadership. Undoubtedly economic strength was very important, and possibly crucial. Once Germany had failed to secure a quick victory, the industrial might of the USSR was always likely to prove decisive. Germany did not even go on to a total war footing until 1942-43, whereas the USSR adopted its peacetime "siege" economy, founded on the Five Year Plans, and was on a total war footing from the start – the USSR massively out-produced the Germans in almost everything. Much Soviet industry was transferred to areas well beyond the reach of the Germans (although this was less smoothly carried out than is often stated), and the population was mobilised.

There has been a lot of debate about Stalin's leadership. He certainly miscalculated in the lead-up to war, refusing to believe that Germany was about to attack. There was a paralysis of leadership at the start of the invasion, with Stalin in a state of shock and the badly-prepared Red Army heavily defeated in the first weeks. However, once Stalin had recovered his nerve, his leadership was in several ways impressive. He used all methods, including religion and propaganda, to stir up patriotic support. The Soviet economy was on a total war footing. Stalin interfered less in operations and appointed good generals. Management of the war was far more effective than in Germany.

Level 1 answers are likely to be very descriptive or based on generalised assertion, with little or no judgement in terms of the question. At Level 2, there will be some valid knowledge, e.g. references to Soviet success in establishing industrial bases beyond the reaches of the Germans, but with little or no commentary explaining why this was so crucial to the eventual Soviet victory. To reach Level 3 or above, the answer should be reasonably wide-ranging, the precise question should be addressed, and certainly various factors should be addressed, although not all to the same extent and the answer is unlikely to be well balanced. Level 4 answers will be reasonably wide ranging and balanced, or argue an effective case for which was the more important factor in securing the Soviet victory. Level 5 answers will contain a well developed substantiated judgement, showing a good level of knowledge and sound understanding of the various factors involved.

Question 4

To what extent did Khrushchev modify the economic and political legacy of Stalinism?
(20 marks)

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 are different aspects to this question. An effective answer is likely to be one which analyses what "Stalinism" actually entailed. This will cover such areas such as the dominant role of the Party in a one-Party state, the dominance of a dictatorial leader; the emphasis on

an industrialised, centrally planned command economy, the all-pervasive nature of a particular ideology reinforced by propaganda and the machinery of a police state, resulting in strict social controls. From there, it is possible to establish the extent to which Khrushchev modified the essentials of the “system”. Politically, there was an important difference: Khrushchev’s approach as leader was very different from Stalin, being far more populist in approach, but importantly, he never exerted as much personal power as Stalin had done. The proof of this is that his colleagues were eventually able to unseat him. On the other hand, although there were reforms of the Party, for example splitting it into industrial and agricultural wings, and trying to reduce bureaucracy and the idea of “jobs for life”, the Party retained its dominance, and was to some extent able to subvert Khrushchev’s reforms. The propaganda remained, although there was less of the cult of personality and fewer extremes. Ideological conformity was still expected although there was a thaw in strict censorship. The powers of the secret police became less arbitrary, although dissidents were still persecuted and many priests were killed. The essence of the planned economy remained, although there were attempts to reform the organisational structures, give more attention to consumer goods and living standards, and improve agriculture. There was still an overall emphasis on heavy industry and defence. Despite Khrushchev’s reforms and “Destalinisation”, the conclusion is likely to be that Khrushchev modified certain aspects of Stalinism, but did not destroy its foundations, nor did he intend to do so.

At Level 1 answers are likely to be dominated by generalised assertion, or description, with relatively little supporting evidence. At Level 2, there will be some valid knowledge, e.g. references to Khrushchev’s reduction in the arbitrary powers of the police, or his attempts to revitalise agriculture – but there will be little or no commentary to explain how this actually modified Stalinist practice, if at all. At Level 3 or above, answers should address both economic and political aspects, and the specific question should be addressed, although there will not necessarily be equal treatment of political and economic aspects and the answer will not necessarily be well balanced. At Level 4 there should be good coverage of both economic and political aspects, and the degree of “modification” should be effectively addressed. Level 5 answers should have a well substantiated judgement, covering all or most aspects and probably assessing Khrushchev’s motives as well as the degree to which he succeeded in carrying them out.