



## **General Certificate of Education**

# **AS History 1041**

**Unit 1: HIS1H**

**Tsarist Russia, 1855–1917**

## **Mark Scheme**

*2009 examination - June series*

**This mark scheme uses the [new numbering system](#) which is being introduced for examinations from June 2010**

The specimen assessment materials are provided to give centres a reasonable idea of the general shape and character of the planned question papers and mark schemes in advance of the operational exams.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2009 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.

## **Generic Introduction for AS**

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which candidates meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a candidate performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

## **CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**

### **AS EXAMINATION PAPERS**

#### **General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)**

---

#### **Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level**

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

---

**Specimen Mark Scheme for examinations in June 2010 onwards**

**GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation**

**HIS1H: Tsarist Russia, 1855–1917**

**Question 1**

- 01** Explain why many Russians were dissatisfied with the decree emancipating the serfs in 1861. (12 marks)

*Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)*

**Generic Mark Scheme**

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

**Indicative content**

Reasons for dissatisfaction with emancipation included:

- a majority of nobles in particular were against the reform to start with since they were used to a long-standing social system which served them well and reform was seen as risky
- it was unlikely that any reform would fulfil Alexander II's conditions of equally satisfying peasants, nobility and government
- the terms of emancipation were complicated and it was spread over stages lasting more than two years
- the economic situation of peasants was little changed because the Act said that land on nobles' estates belonged to the nobles; peasants had to buy the land they were used to

working, apart from forming part of their actual households. In Stage 1 (1861–1863) and even afterwards, peasants still had to pay feudal dues

- in Stage 2 (1863), agreements were negotiated, but landlords had to sell and peasants had to buy and there were fixed limits to prices
- although household serfs were freed, they became landless and had to seek wage labour
- in Stage 3, after negotiations, the Government paid landlords for the land but peasants were saddled with 49 years of redemption payments to the Government. Peasants had simply swapped their master
- peasants still had limited freedom, they were subject to the dictates of the mir
- many nobles were themselves in debt and had lost free labour and feudal dues, and some of their influence in the countryside and in local government. Many found it difficult to adapt
- peasants' complaints were compounded by other developments such as a rising population which put pressure on land.

A good, balanced answer might well consider which were the most significant results of emancipation, and why.

### Question 1

- 02** How important was the backwardness of agriculture in contributing to weaknesses in the Russian economy in the years 1881 to 1914. (24 marks)

*Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)*

### Generic Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit.

**0**

- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**

- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**

- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**

- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

### **Indicative content**

Agriculture was a major problem throughout this period. Over 90% of the population lived in small villages in the mid-nineteenth century. Although there were areas of fertile soil, such as the black earth of the Ukraine, much of the land was unproductive and suffered from drought and extremes of temperature. Lack of fertilisers and machinery, and field rotation, and primitive methods, meant low and unpredictable yields. Many peasants survived by becoming self-sufficient, learning other crafts. But although feudal dues had been abolished in 1861, debts remained after 1861. Significant population growth in the second half of the nineteenth century put even more pressure on land holdings, which reduced in size. Before 1900 there were famines.

Industry was also backward, but got more attention from the Government, particularly after Witte's strategy of encouraging railway building and foreign investment in Russia took off. Agriculture was still neglected, apart from being seen as a source of exports to pay for imports or to guarantee foreign loans. There were some impressive industrial gains, although Russia still fell further behind in the European league table. But until 1905, food production only just about kept pace with the rise in population and since grain exports increased considerably, this meant less food for the population, a decline in living standards and even famine. Land captains sometimes enforced payment of debts by brutal means. Peasant discontent became evident in 1905, despite some concessions in 1902, including cancellation of arrears of taxation. After 1905 there was a reform: a 1905 Law cancelled remaining redemption payments as of 1907 onwards. In 1906 Stolypin introduced a law permitting peasants to separate their land from the commune, consolidate it in one person's hand (the head of the household), and consolidate strips of land into one building. He wanted to encourage a class of well-off, enterprising and loyal peasants. But by 1915 only 22% of households had received individual ownership (30% requested it) – mostly in the west and south where there was already a tradition of independent farming. Therefore, the agricultural economy, on which Russia still depended, remained poor and backward, and progressed at a slower pace than industry.

Candidates may approach this question in two ways: either by just assessing agriculture; or by assessing the contribution of agriculture as opposed to 'other' factors. However, there must be some assessment of agriculture.

---

**Question 2**

**03** Explain why Nicholas II issued the October Manifesto in 1905. (12 marks)

*Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)*

**Generic Mark Scheme**

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

**L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

**L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**

**L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

**L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

**Indicative content**

Nicholas II issued the October Manifesto because of the threat to his regime from the 1905 Revolution, which came about for several reasons: dissatisfaction with living and working conditions, the failure of the autocracy to reform, revolutionary activity, the desire of liberals (mainly middle-class) for constitutional government. Although dissatisfied groups were disunited, the regime appeared under threat. Although Nicholas was stubborn, his minister Witte persuaded him to make the concession of the Manifesto. There were doubts about the reliability of the army because of defeat against Japan, communications were breaking down, and the economic and financial system was close to collapse. Witte believed that he could appease the Liberals by offering political concessions, hence the Manifesto offered civil liberties and a state Duma elected by universal male suffrage and with a share in law making. The Manifesto succeeded in that many Liberals such as the Kadets welcomed the concession, and radical revolutionaries were left isolated and ready to be picked off by the Government.

The best answers will probably prioritise or link the reasons effectively.

**Question 2**

- 04** How important were the Dumas in contributing to stable government in Russia in the years 1906 to 1914? (24 marks)

*Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)*

**Generic Mark Scheme**

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

**Indicative content**

The Dumas were largely a sop to the Liberals from the regime, to win back their support in the 1905 Revolution. Nicholas II had no intention of relinquishing his autocratic power, as was made clear in the Fundamental Laws.

The Dumas were allowed little impact on government. The electoral system discriminated in favour of landlords and peasants and against workers. The State Council, the Upper House, was nominated by the Tsar. Ministers were responsible only to the Tsar, who could rule by decree when the Duma was not in session.

The Dumas struggled to impose themselves from the start. The First Duma in 1906 was dominated by the Kadets, who were liberals but too radical for the regime. Their demands for land reform and constitutional change led to the dissolution of the Duma. The Kadet deputies who protested in the Vyborg Manifesto got little response. The Second Duma was more radical, because it also contained Social Democrats, but it only lasted five months. Stolypin then (illegally) passed a new law which manipulated the franchise making it even more weighted in favour of the upper and middle-class electors. The Third Duma therefore lasted from 1907 to 1912, dominated by the conservative Octobrists. However, even those broke off co-operation with the regime in 1911, deciding that the Tsar was too reactionary. When it had run its course, new elections were held (again rigged) for the Fourth Duma. Disagreements among the conservative parties made it less compliant, but war brought temporary unity in 1914.

The Duma experiment was scarcely a success for those who wanted representative government. In its ten years, only one law initiated by the Duma was approved by the State Council. All other proposals from the Dumas were rejected or severely modified.

The conclusion must be that stable government in Russia after 1906 was not due to the Dumas as such. Other factors responsible for stability could include:

- the fact that there had never been a unified spirit of revolution, even in 1905
- the work of Stolypin to 1911, combining repression and reform
- traditional loyalty to the tsar, and the support of the military
- economic growth
- the lack of effective political opposition from any quarter.

Candidates are likely to explore these or other aspects in order to explain stable government – but the focus of the argument should be on the Dumas.

Candidates may approach this question in two ways: either by just assessing the role of the Dumas; or by assessing the role of the Dumas as opposed to ‘other’ factors. However, there must be some assessment of the Dumas.

**Question 3**

- 05** Explain why Russians were increasingly dissatisfied with Nicholas II's wartime leadership in the years 1915 to 1917. (12 marks)

*Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)*

**Generic Mark Scheme**

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

**Indicative content**

Nicholas II benefited at the outbreak of war from a surge of national unity. However, a series of war disasters and major problems soon brought a change in attitude, particularly after the Tsar took command of the army and all problems tended to be blamed on him. Although there were few active revolutionaries in Russia, by 1917 the Tsar's leadership was severely questioned and there were few groups left willing to fight for him:

- military defeats were blamed on the Tsar, especially after he went to the Front as commander-in-chief in September 1915
- the Tsarina and Rasputin were largely left in charge at home: their interference in political appointments, suspicion of the German Tsarina, her association with the debauched Rasputin – all helped to discredit the Government
- the Tsar missed opportunities to get people on his side during the war. He refused political concessions, especially when the Progressive Bloc in the Duma asked for a say in ruling the country through the Tsar appointing a 'Government of National Confidence'. The Tsar's obstinacy in refusing to modify the autocracy proved disastrous
- the war was partly run not by the Government but by semi-official bodies from the Duma and the zemstvos, for example co-ordinating war production. The discredited, dithering Tsar simply seemed irrelevant
- even the generals refused to support Nicholas II by 1917.

Good answers might prioritise these reasons.

### Question 3

- 06** How far were the weaknesses of the Provisional Government responsible for the Revolution of October/November 1917? (24 marks)

*Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)*

### Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

### Indicative content

The Provisional Government had weaknesses and made mistakes:

- it continued the war out of loyalty to the Allies and a desire to establish authority and prestige through military victory
- it postponed desired reforms such as land reform and setting up a Constituent Assembly
- it underestimated the threat of the Bolsheviks – Kerensky in October seemed to think that the Bolsheviks could easily be dispersed as in the July Days, and his announcement

of taking action against the Bolsheviks inspired support for the soviets because they seemed to be under threat

- the Provisional Government's power was limited by its non-representative character (not elected) and by early competition from the Soviet (Order No. 1)
- there were divisions within the Provisional Government between socialist and liberal members
- the continuation of the War meant that existing problems also continued – shortages, casualties, demoralisation etc. Above all the army was disintegrating. Failure to keep order alienated even upper-class supporters
- it handled the Kornilov Crisis badly, playing into the Bolsheviks' hands
- the poorly supported Provisional Government could not summon enough loyal forces to prevent the Bolshevik coup.

A good answer will also examine some of the other factors, these will include the strengths of Lenin and the Bolsheviks and the war situation, leading to a power vacuum in Russia. Various factors should be related to each other. The main focus should be on the Provisional Government and there should also be an overall judgement, well-substantiated.

Although answers will probably focus on the Provisional Government, because the key phrase is 'how far', candidates **must** address **to some extent** the contribution made by 'other' factors in order to evaluate the role of the Government.