

AS History

7041/1H-Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855–1964

Component 1H Autocracy, Reform and Revolution: Russia, 1855–1917
Mark scheme

June 2018

Version/Stage: 1.0 Final

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

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

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

System Name	Description
?	Questionable or unclear comment or fact
^	Omission – of evidence or comment
Cross	Inaccurate fact
H Line	Incorrect or dubious comment or information
IR	Irrelevant material
SEEN_BIG	Use to mark blank pages or plans
Tick	Creditworthy comment or fact
On page comment	Use text box if necessary to exemplify other annotations and add further comment. Always provide a text box comment at the end of each answer.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, i.e. if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855–1964

Component 1H Autocracy, Reform and Revolution: Russia, 1855–1917

Section A

- 01** With reference to these extracts and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two extracts provides the more convincing interpretation of support for opposition in Russia in the 1870s? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO3

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

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

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

Extract A: In their identification of Sixsmith's argument, students may refer to the following:

- support for opposition came about because Alexander II's reforms (and particularly emancipation) failed to meet expectations; this led to grievances and growth of revolutionary movements such as Populism
- Alexander's reforms had shown the possibility of change and encouraged Russian people (and in particular, a 'growing social class' to demand more)
- there was widespread anger among peasants burdened by reparation payments which made them ready fodder for the Populists who wanted to awaken the peasants' revolutionary consciousness.

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

- Alexander II's reforms (including relaxation of censorship, fairer justice with trials, elected zemstva in countryside and town dumas) gave more opportunity for debate on reform but increased reaction from the 1870s and limitations of reforms provoked opposition
- this came at a time of economic change – with industrial growth and the emergence of an entrepreneurial middle class and intelligentsia, some of whom were attracted by socialism and took the lead in opposition movements
- emancipation did not fulfil all the peasants expected and left them with debts and land-hunger: however, the Populists didn't succeed and they were not supportive of opposition movements in the 1870s.

Extract B: In their identification of Saunders' argument, students may refer to the following:

- the masses were loyal to the Tsar; revolutionary opposition received support from a minority only
- there was no mass dissatisfaction with tsarist policies in the 1860s and 1870s, despite change; peasants and workers did not share or understand the views of opponents of tsardom and retained their 'monarchist ideals', with economic, not political concerns
- the Populists found little support among the peasants, who looked to the Tsar to relieve their misery. Workers in the towns felt much the same.

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

- only a small group of the intelligentsia had the education and understanding to respond to the illegally imported socialist/Marxist literature that fomented opposition; the masses may have remained loyal out of fear
- there was dissatisfaction and support for revolutionary action, as seen in the trial of Vera Zasulich and her popular acquittal, but economic factors (particularly price of food) predominated over political agitation because of poor wages and low living standards
- Populists were betrayed to the authorities by 'loyal' peasants; support from towns only grew after industrialisation intensified in the 1890s.

In arriving at a judgement as to which extract provides the more convincing interpretation, students might suggest that whilst Extract A leaves the case open, Extract B makes it quite clear that the Populists failed, whatever the level of discontent. Overall, knowledge of the failure of opposition in the 1870s would suggest that Extract B is the more convincing.

Section B

02 'In the years 1894 to 1914, the Russian economy became strong and well-developed.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments suggesting that in the years 1894 to 1914, the Russian economy became strong and well-developed might include:

- annual growth rate of over 8% pa 1894–1913; increase (roughly doubling) in annual production of key materials coal, pig iron, oil, grain, 1900–1914; increase in railway trackage
- improvements in infrastructure, e.g. banking and development of Trans-Siberian railway – acted as industrial stimulus, opened up Western Siberia
- heavy industry flourished relative to light industry; by 1914, Russia was the world's fifth largest industrial power
- development, under state-control, ensured funding and development of large modern factories; by 1914 internal investment was replacing reliance on foreigners; 25% of government income came from industrial investment 1903–1913.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1894 to 1914, the Russian economy became strong and well-developed might include:

- in 1914 Russia was the least developed European power; agriculture variable (and Stolypin's reforms yet to have much impact) and backward in many areas; Siberia still largely unexploited and problems of communications; railway coverage small in relation to size of country
- development was uneven – almost exclusively in 'European Russia' (in and around St Petersburg/Moscow/Poland/Ukraine); remainder had very little industry; south and east (except Baku) primitive and most industry, small-scale domestic; modern industrial equipment had to be imported
- overall, only marginal increase in number of factories and workers – and both in line with overall population increase 1908–1914
- development had been skewed by state involvement; Russia lacked a strong entrepreneurial class; internal demand was still limited.

Students are likely to argue that significant economic advances had taken place in Russia by 1914, but that much depended on the area; the economy of many regions was weak and undeveloped. They might point out that whilst the growth figures might look impressive, Russia had started from a very low base point in the 1890s and in 1914 remained still well-behind Britain, USA, France and Germany. Whatever the judgement, reward any balanced and substantiated argument.

- 03** 'The effect of the First World War on Russia was the key factor in the Bolsheviks' path to power in the years 1903 to 1917.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments suggesting that the effect of the First World War on Russia was the key factor in the Bolsheviks' path to power in the years 1903 to 1917 might include:

- the Bolsheviks made limited progress before 1914 – they argued with Mensheviks, suffered tsarist repression, lost leaders to exile, had limited funds, failed to exploit situation in 1905/6 and did not participate in first Duma
- the effect of war was to spread economic and social distress, increasing numbers of unemployed in cities (especially Petrograd) who became prey to Bolshevik propaganda
- after the Tsar's abdication (March 1917) the continuation of the war by the Provisional Government gave a focus for Bolshevik propaganda (Lenin's promise of 'peace' in April Theses); war helped unite workers and peasants against the Provisional Government
- Lenin's return was facilitated by the Germans. The Bolsheviks received German funding. Lenin's first decree 'on peace' showed importance of war as a rallying cry.

Arguments challenging the view that the effect of the First World War on Russia was the key factor in the Bolsheviks' path to power in the years 1903 to 1917 might include:

- at the outbreak of war, Bolshevik support was actually diminished as they opposed war amidst general patriotic fervour
- it was the removal of Tsarist repression by 1917 that affected the Bolshevik path to power; once its leaders could speak openly within Russia, and the workers were no longer cowed, the Party grew in strength (the Party had established the basis for this pre-1917; underground networks in factories and workshops; Pravda, 1912; seats in 4th Duma)
- the Bolsheviks seized power as a result of their ideology/promises (e.g. 'all power to the soviets' – broader than merely ending war), their leadership (Lenin and Trotsky) and organisation, in contrast to a weak and illegitimate Provisional Government which refused to make changes before the election of a Constituent Assembly
- it was, in part, the fortuitous circumstances following the Kornilov coup in July 1917, which left the Bolsheviks armed, that provided for the Bolsheviks' seizure of power in October.

Students are likely to argue that, whilst the First World War made a radical change to Bolshevik fortunes, it did more to end tsardom and it was the collapse of the autocracy (more than the war itself, which had raged for three years without any noticeable advance for the Bolsheviks) that was the key to the improvement of the Bolsheviks' position. Reward any well-argued and balanced answer which offers a supported judgement.