



General Certificate of Education

History 5041

Alternative F Russia and the USSR, 1855–1991

Mark Scheme

2006 examination – January series

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.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

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

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

The 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 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.

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.

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) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section C).

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Level 1:

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

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

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

Level 2:

Either

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

Or

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

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Level 3:

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

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Level 4:

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

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Level 5:

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

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

C: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

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.

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

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

Explain briefly the significance of ‘poor military performance’ (line 2) in the context of Russia’s efforts in the First World War before 1917. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. Russia had been doing badly in the First World War. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. Russia’s poor military performance and the strains which this created in Russia, physically and psychologically, played a significant part in undermining support for the tsarist regime, and allowed the February Revolution to succeed, since ultimately the Tsar’s power rested on the army and he had little other support by 1917. **2-3**

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

Explain how the views expressed in **Source B** differ from the views in **Source A** about the outbreak of the February/March 1917 Revolution. (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. Source A implies that the Revolution was very sudden, whereas Source B implies that events had long been building towards it. **1-2**
- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge, e.g. points out that although the Tsar was surprised by the outbreak of Revolution, police reports had long been painting a picture of disillusionment resulting from military defeat and domestic shortages brought about by the war. **3-5**

- L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. Source A claims that the Revolution was a spontaneous affair and that everyone either supported it or just accepted it, basically because it was so sudden. Also the fact that it was so sudden and widespread meant that the authorities might have been unable to prevent it even had they wished. In contrast, Source B, at least by implication, might suggest that there was organisation or at least a burst of anti-government feeling about to explode, with its virulent criticisms of the regime and its call for action. References to “solidarity” and “United Committee” suggest possibly organisation, and therefore that the revolution should not have come as such a surprise.

The provenance of the sources is important. Source A is an official British report. It was written 4 years after the revolution. Where did the author(s) get his information? From Russian or British sources? Was it coloured by anti-revolutionary feeling engendered by the Civil War of 1918–1921 and nostalgia for the old regime? Source B is bound to sound more enthusiastic about the revolution because it was written by revolutionaries. The SPD welcomed the revolution as the bourgeois stage before the development of socialism, and the chance to completely change the old order. It was written on the outbreak of the revolution. It lacks the benefit of hindsight, but it does have immediacy. It is of course not objective. Can it be trusted?

Own knowledge tells us that there are elements of truth in both sources. Source A is correct in so far as much of the Revolution was spontaneous and largely leaderless – a reaction against the war and associated difficulties rather than an overtly political strike against the regime. On the other hand, Source B is correct in its assertion about some of the problems such as death and inflation. Comments about the capitalists are open to debate. We cannot dismiss it as pure propaganda, because we know that there was political activity amongst sections of the working class – the question is, how significant was it? The differences between the sources are as much about tone as about content.

6-7

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

Explain the importance of political opposition to the Tsarist regime, in relation to other factors, in bringing about the Russian Revolution of February/March 1917.

(15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations, which could apply to almost any time and/or place, based *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

There was a growing sense of disillusionment with the autocracy as the War progressed badly, although this was not necessarily translated into direct political action, since there were traditional reserves of loyalty to the Tsar. There had been political opposition in the past, especially at the time of the 1905 Revolution, although it was not necessarily organised as opposed to sporadic outbursts of discontent. Revolutionary, radical groups such as the Bolsheviks, Mensheviks and SRs did of course exist, but they had relatively little support. The Revolution was crushed. Other forms of opposition existed after 1905: liberal opposition in the form of the Kadets, who wanted a constitutional monarchy. There was also some opposition, not particularly organised, from some of Russia's rising middle class which felt excluded from power, and from the aristocracy which had lost much of its influence. However, the regime survived the 1905 Revolution, and although the Duma provided some forum for opposition, it was manipulated and relatively docile overall. Potential discontent

amongst peasants was to some extent alleviated by agrarian reforms. There were still pockets of unrest, and occasional explosions as at the Lena goldfields in 1912. But whatever the debate about Russian stability and evidence of industrial unrest and politically motivated strikes, the regime seemed relatively secure in 1914, and benefited from initial patriotism on the outbreak of war. Things changes as the war situation deteriorated. Opposition to the tsarist regime did then develop, fuelled by uneasiness about the government apparently in the hands of the Empress and Rasputin whilst the Tsar was at the Front. Ministerial changes did not help. Although the Duma had agreed to its dissolution in 1914, discontent led to its reassembly in 1915. However, the Tsar exasperated politicians by his refusal to cooperate more with non-government organisations and to replace incompetent ministers. The Progressive Bloc formed, with Kadets, Octobrists, Nationalists and some others. The Bloc became more of an opposition as the Tsar would not compromise. Opposition was also characterised by the killing of Rasputin. The significance of the growing opposition was that, when the crisis erupted in 1917, there were too few influential Russians, including politicians, prepared to support him, and hence his abdication. However, it might well be argued that other factors, such as military defeat, shortages, inflation and so on, created the crisis situation which fed the opposition and made the Tsar's position so ultimately untenable. There are unlikely to be many debates about the extent to which industrial workers were politicised before 1917, although if this is discussed it should be credited.

Source A does not indicate organised political opposition, but rather implies that there was general dissatisfaction with the regime by 1917. The source specifically denies that there was organised opposition. Source B implies political opposition, simply because the source is full of political slogans, references to class warfare and so on. However, the source itself cannot prove how widespread these attitudes were, or whether in fact the authors of the source represented a serious political threat to the regime. Source C implies a lack of support for the regime by the people, but this is not the same as outright opposition or resistance. The source also refers to other significant factors: economic problems and military defeats, which may be as significant or even more so than "political opposition".

Answers at Level 1 are likely to focus on a limited account of the opposition. At Level 2 there will be a greater range and selectivity in use of evidence and some attempt to relate opposition to the revolution. Level 3 responses will have greater accuracy, range and depth and will make some specific links between political opposition and the revolution. At Level 4 the links will be argued more convincingly and there will be good coverage of the types of opposition. Level 5 answers will probably cross reference sources and own knowledge effectively and draw clear conclusions about the lead up to the Revolution.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by ‘practical problems’ in the context of the carrying out of the emancipation of the serfs in 1861. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. there was opposition from some serf owners, or it was difficult to sort out issues of compensation or payment. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the emancipation took some time, being carried out in stages. Arrangements had to be made to allow for the handover of land, and redemption payments. The issue about compensation for the aristocracy and how the freed serfs would fit into society were major issues. Very few people, including serf owners and serfs themselves, were very happy with the arrangements. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Alexander II carried out reforms in Russia. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Alexander wanted to improve the lives of the Russian people. Alexander wanted to win support. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. Russia needed reform following its defeat in the Crimean War. The army needed reform if it were to regain its military reputation and modernise. There were concerns about the morality and efficiency of serfdom. There were fears of a major serf revolt. If serfs were emancipated and nobles lost their powers, the issue of rural control had to be addressed. There was a concern to modernise Russia: this meant reforms in areas like justice and education. Alexander was thought to have some liberal leanings. Some Russians wanted to modernise Russia on Western lines. **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. develops at least some of the points as in Level 2 and links them. For example, links the issue of defeat in war explicitly to reform; links emancipation with reforms in the structure of the army; links the loss of aristocratic rights with the development of local government through the zemstvos. There may be comments about the overall nature of the reforms in terms of motives: e.g. the fact that political reform of the autocracy was noticeably absent; the relative importance of ideological (i.e. “liberal”) and pragmatic (i.e. “efficiency”) motives. **6-7**

- (c) 'The reforms of Alexander II were insufficient to change Russia from a backward, semi-feudal society into a modern state.'
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

Alexander's reforms were important but scarcely changed Russia into a modern state. The abolition of serfdom certainly abolished a feudal remnant, but the peasantry were still very poor and largely tied to the land in a backward and inefficient way in most areas, whilst a growing population and periodic food shortages worsened the situation. The army was partially modernised by reform, but was hardly a modern fighting force. The educational reforms benefited students but not the population as a whole. Reform of the legal code was progressive, but not enough to liberalise Russia overnight. Reform of the censorship benefited intellectuals perhaps, but not ordinary Russians. Above all, the Tsar would not change the basic structure of the autocracy, whilst the beginnings of major industrial change were certainly not sufficient to radically modernise the economy at this stage. Therefore the reforms were important, but not decisive, and candidates will probably explain that this limited period of reform came largely to an end in the mid 1860s following the Polish Revolt and the attempts on the Tsar's life. The limited scope of reform also helps to account for the rise in radical opposition to the regime.

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 change or limited nature of it. Level 3 responses will have greater accuracy, range

and depth and will make some specific links between the reforms and their impact. At Level 4 the links will be argued more convincingly and there will be good coverage of the nature and there will be good coverage of the nature of reforms and their impact. Level 5 answers will additionally draw out and explain the relation between reforms and their impact at a sustained level.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by ‘split between liberals and revolutionaries’ in the context of opposition to the Tsarist regime at the time of the 1905 Revolution. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. both moderates and extremists opposed the Tsar on the eve of the 1905 Revolution. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. liberals were often middle-class intellectuals or liberal aristocrats who did not want revolutionary change or even the overthrow of the Tsar, but they did want constitutional change, probably on western lines, with some kind of constitutional monarchy and responsible government. In contrast, revolutionaries such as the Social Democrats and Social Revolutionaries wanted the overthrow of the Tsar, but more than that – they also wanted a complete overturn of the existing social, economic and political order, and as such were not interested in compromise with the existing order. Both groups appeared to be briefly on the same side at the time of the 1905 Revolution, although they quickly diverged as the regime responded to events with repression and concessions. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why revolution broke out in Russia in 1905. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. revolution broke out because Russians were unhappy with the Tsar and their lives. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the Revolution was provoked by Russia’s defeat in the Russo-Japanese War, which appeared to show the incompetence of the regime. Other factors included the discontent of poverty-stricken workers and peasants, represented also by the 1905 “Bloody Sunday” massacre. Revolutionaries such as Social Democrats and Social Revolutionaries were agitating for an overthrow of the regime. Liberal opponents objected to the autocracy and wanted constitutional change. Previous reforms had been insufficient to appease reformers or had been withdrawn. Industrialisation and rural problems such as land shortage and periodic famine had created new social pressures. Nicholas II showed no sign of wishing reform. **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. distinguishes between long-term, short-term and immediate causes. Long-term includes dissatisfaction of those with strong political views and those affected by previous events such as the emancipation of the serfs which had created discontent. Medium-term might include growing dissatisfaction by the new middle class which lacked a political voice and the new pressures created by industrialisation such as the economic slumps and a concentrated working class. Immediate events would include the war against Japan. The relative importance or linking of these factors might be briefly explored. Answers might explore the idea that the events of the Revolution such as Bloody Sunday and the Potemkin Mutiny were only loosely connected and did not really constitute a “revolution”, but this approach is not essential. **6-7**

- (c) ‘By 1911, Nicholas II’s regime had completely overcome the threat posed by the 1905 Revolution.
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

The regime partly survived the Revolution by timely concessions which divided the opposition. The granting of the Duma appeased those who wanted constitutional

concessions, which they believed would reduce the power of the autocracy. In so doing, radical revolutionaries such as the SPD were isolated and crushed or driven underground. The bulk of the army remained loyal and enabled the regime to enforce its authority. The threat of the Revolution was also lessened by the very fact that it had not been a coordinated event, but a series of largely disparate events, such as Bloody Sunday and the Potemkin Mutiny, and lacked overall leadership or unity. Stolypin's repression was largely effective. Thousands of revolutionaries were tried by summary court martials and executed. Leaders of revolutionary parties were exiled in Siberia or went abroad. There were milder forms of repression which nevertheless preserved the autocracy. When the first Duma met in 1906 and challenged the Tsar, it was dissolved. A similar fate befell the second. Manipulation of the electoral system then ensured more conservative Dumas, after 1907, although they were not completely compliant. Nevertheless, the Dumas were manipulated by Stolypin and others.

Reform was also significant. Stolypin's agrarian reforms were designed to create a prosperous, loyal, landholding peasantry. The measure was partially successful: thousands of peasants did buy their own land – but the fundamental system of landownership remained compliant. There was the potential for trouble in the factories and slums of growing industrial cities like Moscow and St. Petersburg, but the threat of revolution or major disturbances seemed to have been contained. Nevertheless, Stolypin's assassination in 1911 was probably a disaster, because subsequent ministers lacked his ability. Political and economic discontent began to rise after 1911.

Answers are likely to conclude that both conciliation and repression played their part in preserving the regime, although the balance may be argued over, and there may well be a discussion as to how serious any "threat" actually was.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to focus on a limited account on repression and concession after 1905. 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 how the regime survived after 1905. Level 3 responses will have greater accuracy, range and depth and will make some specific links between repression, concessions and stability. At Level 4 the links will be argued more convincingly and there will be good coverage of the six years. Level 5 answers will additionally make sustained judgements and conclusions.