



General Certificate in Education

AS History 5041

Alternative F Unit 1

Mark Scheme

2008 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.

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

Copyright © 2008 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.

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.

January 2008

Alternative F: Russia and the USSR, 1855–1991

AS Unit 1: Tsarist and Revolutionary Russia, 1855–1917

Question 1

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

Explain briefly the importance of 'removing Russian finances from foreign control' (lines 5 and 6) in the context of dissatisfaction with the Tsarist regime by 1913. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. people objected to foreign influence. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. recognition that Russian economic and financial development since the 1880s was heavily dependent on foreign (especially French) investment and influence. This was seen by some as unpatriotic and possibly dangerous for future stability/prosperity. **2-3**

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

Explain how the views expressed in **Source B** differ from the views put forward in **Source A** about support for the Tsarist regime. (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: Basic statement identifying the views expressed in the sources based on the content of the sources, e.g. Source A supports the Tsarist regime; Source B is strongly against the regime. **1-2**
- L2: Developed comparison of the views expressed in the sources, based on content and own knowledge, e.g. points out that Source A is not just supportive of the Tsar, but is calling for even tougher measures against opponents of the regime. Source B condemns all aspects of the regime and the existing social order. It calls for the abolition of autocracy, the introduction of full democracy and civil rights, radical religious, military and educational policies, and a radical land policy, designed to appeal to its peasant workers. Whereas Source A offers mainly firm support for the regime, although with some qualifications, Source B offers no possibility of compromise or acceptance of limited reform. **3-5**

- L3: Developed evaluation of the sources, with reference to the sources and own knowledge, drawing conclusions about the extent to which Source B challenges Source A, e.g. Source A shows the opinions of a political grouping which clearly supported the regime. Source B is the programme of the largest and best supported of the revolutionary parties, which aimed to get support from the peasantry rather than the urban proletariat. Source A was produced soon after the 1905 Revolution when feelings were still running high, and the regime was still feeling shock at recent events. Source B is also from the aftermath of the Revolution, when the regime was beginning to regroup, but revolutionaries might still have been hopeful of making things happen. Candidates may well explain that neither source is necessarily representative. Not just right wing political groups and Octoberists but also liberals wanted to preserve the regime. A notable point about both sources is that they represent extreme views. Source A shows belief in the supreme autocratic power of the Tsar, and calls for extreme action against 'anarchists and revolutionaries' – although interestingly, the source also calls for social reforms, either out of genuine belief because the authors see this as necessary to get popular support for the regime at a difficult time. It is difficult to know how representative these views were, although the anti-Semitic prejudice was typical of many Russians, and was sometimes encouraged by those around the Tsar and the Tsar himself. Source B is very radical, but it is built on the tradition of nineteenth century populism, and as such was different from the more tightly knit, smaller Social Democrat Party which aimed to appeal more to the working class. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of the weakness of political opposition, in relation to other factors, in explaining the survival of the Tsarist regime between 1905 and 1914.

(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* 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

Answers may include material on the 1905 Revolution itself, or focus on the period from immediately after the Revolution down to 1914, or both. Clearly the regime survived, and there were arguments as to whether it was more secure in 1914 than at the time of the 1905 Revolution and, if so, why.

Good answers are likely to consider the extent to which there was specifically political opposition, in the sense of people opposing the regime with a political agenda; and the extent to which there was a more general feeling of dissatisfaction with specific aspects of Government policy, in addition to feelings of positive support, indifference or apathy.

Source A shows that there was some positive support for the regime, with a clear expression of support for autocracy – albeit it also calls for reform within the system, demands which were only partly met in the following years. However, the source gives no indication of how representative these views were, and candidates are unlikely to know much, if anything, about this specific group. Also the source comes from 1906, in the aftermath of the Revolution, and it is not a good guide for attitudes in 1914. Source B represents a strong anti-tsarist, anti-establishment view, and is clearly an example of political opposition. In itself it does not indicate strength or weakness. However, candidates should work out from the radical political, economic and social demands that this programme, even though it was from the largest of the radical parties, would have had limited or no appeal for most Russians, at least as the programme rests in its entirety. Source C refers to flaws in the regime, which were likely to encourage opposition. The source also claims that opposition from the revolutionary Left was underestimated, that corruption was rife and that the state was ‘weak’. This might have encouraged opposition – although possibly the argument is overstated.

Candidates should consider other factors. These will include the failure of the 1905 Revolution through a variety of factors such as lack of unity, differences between liberal and radical opposition and measures such as the October Manifesto and creation of the Duma. Answers may well develop the work of Stolypin: a mixture of repression, savagely suppressing revolution and taking reprisals, reform – notably agrarian reform – and management of the Duma up to his death in 1911. Answers may debate the impact of reform, e.g. the burdens on the peasantry were partially lifted, but only a minority of peasants took advantage of opportunities to separate from the mir and develop their land.

There were other factors which helped the regime, and not necessarily the result of its own actions: for example economic development, no longer so dependent on direct government input as in Witte’s day. Opposition was hampered by the fact that many revolutionary leaders were in exile; and groups like the peasantry were traditionally conservative and difficult to organise, whilst the industrial proletariat was still relatively small. On the other hand, candidates might mention the development of politically motivated strikes after 1912.

Therefore there is no ‘correct’ answer as to why the regime survived, but there is plenty of scope to debate. Answers at Level 1 are likely to be generalised. At Level 2 there may be descriptive accounts of opposition, without explicitly addressing ‘political’ aspects, or basic descriptions of ‘other’ factors, but without relating the two or explicitly addressing the question. Level 3 responses will have accuracy of detail, some range of depth, and will explicitly address the question to the extent of relating the issue of political opposition to stability. At Level 4 the links between different factors will be argued more convincingly and there should be good coverage of both political opposition and other factors. Level 5 answers will use both sources

and own knowledge effectively in doing this, draw clear conclusions about 'survival' and show sustained judgement.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'the results showed a gap between theory and practice' in the context of the emancipation of the serfs in Russia. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. stating that the serfs were freed in 1861. **1**

- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. develops the gap between theory and practice. This could either be an explanation of the fact that, due to complications of such a massive change, the process of emancipation was very slow. There were different stages to emancipation. Between 1861 and 1863, serfs were legally freed, but their economic status changed little, since ties with the landowners were not severed until 1863, when peasants began to negotiate the purchase of land. Only then did Stage 3 begin, when the Government paid landlords the purchase price and peasants began redemption payments. In this sense there was a gap between theory and practice.

Alternatively, candidates could explain the term by focusing on the fact that although in theory peasants were now free, in reality their lives did not significantly improve: they were burdened with redemption payments, a growing population put pressure on land ownership, there were periodic famines, and peasants were eventually subject to new restrictions imposed by the mir or Land Captains. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Alexander III reversed many of the reforms of Alexander II. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Alexander III was determined to rule more strictly than his predecessor. **1-2**

- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. Alexander was responding in large part to the fact that his father had been a 'reforming' tsar, yet had encountered growing opposition and discontent which led eventually to his assassination. Alexander III thought both that firmer government was safer, but also it was what Russia needed. He believed in Nicholas I's dictates about orthodoxy, autocracy and nationalism and he had no intention of weakening the autocracy. He was influenced strongly by the reactionary Pobedonostev. Alexander III had been trained for the army and was a natural autocrat. Some of his actions had very specific motives. For example, new measures of state security increased government powers, partly because of the opposition groups which had developed during the 1860s and 1870s. Censorship was tightened up for the same reason. Land Captains were designed to increase control over the peasantry. Reducing the powers of Zemstva increased government control. There was increased control of universities and restrictions on the entry of ordinary people to secondary and higher education, so as to restrict the influence of radical

intelligentsia. Russification included attempts to impose Russian control on national minorities. **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 in Level 2 and links them. Candidates may show how a reaction to Alexander II's reign fitted neatly with Alexander III's own preferences; they may point out that not all reforms were reversed, and there were some further reforms, for example the reduction in redemption payments, the end of poll tax, the Peasants' Land Bank, factory legislation. Although altered in character, institutions like the Zemstva continued. There was economic development, particularly industrialisation. Therefore, it was not all reaction, although certainly there was a new sense of authority and a clear statement that autocracy would continue and that stability meant counter-reform where necessary. **6-7**

- (c) 'The Tsarist regime was more secure at the time of Alexander III's death in 1894 than it had been when Alexander II came to power in 1855.'
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

Most of the great reforms associated with Alexander II – emancipation, military reforms, educational reforms, censorship, the zemstvo – took place in the early to mid 1860s. Following the Polish revolt and an attempt on the Tsar's life, the reforms dried up or were modified. Although Alexander II was considering the possibility of further changes, even some political reform, at the time of his assassination, he never had any intention of reducing the power of the autocracy. Alexander III was never a serious reformer (apart from a few reforms in taxation and

factory legislation), both by inclination and because he realised that regimes were most under threat when they reformed. It was also realised that disappointment with the limited impact of his father's reforms had caused resentment and opposition, from groups such as the Populists.

There is no 'right' answer to the question of how secure the regime was either in 1855, 1881 or 1894, and therefore any well-reasoned answer must be credited. Alexander II came to the throne at a difficult time, in the middle of the Crimean War, which was not going well for Russia. Although Russia's weaknesses could not be blamed on him personally, they created a crisis. Alexander obviously felt that social stability was increasingly threatened by resentment against serfdom, which had been evident in the past and was growing. He was prepared, in order to 'stop revolution from below', to abolish serfdom. Although disappointment at the outcome, both from nobles and peasants, led to disturbances after 1861, it would be difficult to argue that politically the regime was under major threat at this stage. Alexander then implemented a series of reforms; some, like the military reforms, were possibly more positive in results than others. There was certainly resentment in society – from nobles resenting the loss of serfs, and often increasingly in debt; from an emerging middle class which felt excluded from power; from peasants discontented with their lot. But overt opposition was limited and not united. Anarchists and nihilists posed no major threat. The Populists found peasants unresponsive when they went into the villages to preach change. Lack of opportunities for political expression and other problems made it difficult for opponents, and the Tsar could count on vast reserves of traditional loyalty. Although Alexander II was unlucky in being assassinated, this was not the result of a nationwide revolt.

Likewise, Alexander III did not face major threats. The secret police kept a close watch on opponents. There was censorship. The emergence of Marxist groups caused scarcely a ripple, especially as they mostly disavowed political violence, settling for social and economic analysis instead. The Government was relatively tolerant of most opponents; internal exile could have been much worse. Industrialisation was gradually creating a proletariat which could pose a threat in the future, and there were periodic disturbances in the countryside, but nothing major. Alexander III stood firm in his autocratic, hard line beliefs, and his regime seemed secure at the time of his unexpected death.

Answers at Level 1 will be generalised, possibly with very simple narrative or description. Level 2 answers will also probably be mainly descriptive, focusing on the measures associated with both Tsars and possibly the opposition, but not seriously attempting to consider the security of the regime. At Level 3 there will be some focus on how secure both regimes of Alexander II and Alexander III were, although the focus may be unbalanced and lacking depth, and there may be minimal comparison. At Level 4 the analysis will be balanced and broad, and with explicit reference to the issue of how secure the regimes were. Level 5 answers will also be well developed, but additionally will contain sustained judgement and a comparison of how secure the regimes were at different times, and why, in relation to the exact question.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'the unity displayed in 1914' in the context of Russia's entry into the First World War. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. the Russian Government and Tsar agreed on entry into the war in 1914. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. although there were some misgivings amongst the ruling group (however that is defined) caused by hostility to

Rasputin, concern over war, and some resentment from those who felt they deserved more influence in the administration, the unity of the ruling group – Tsar, ministers and nobility – was reasonably secure in 1914. Russia entered the war in 1914 with an almost universal sense of patriotism and optimism. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why revolutionary parties had limited influence in Russia between 1914 and February 1917. **(7 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. the regime was not seriously threatened by the impact of war before 1917. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. explaining the nature of opposition to the Government during the War. There was initial patriotism and support for the war from almost all Russians, except for the Bolsheviks, in 1914. This soon dissipated because of massive military defeats, mounting problems at home, and the Tsar's evident unwillingness or inability to deal with the situation. Nevertheless the revolutionary parties had little influence. Many of their leaders were abroad or in internal exile. The parties themselves had relatively small memberships and were supervised and often infiltrated by police agents. The regime still had reserves of loyalty to call upon. Most Russian socialists, including many SRs and Mensheviks, rallied to the war effort. Although people grumbled about shortages, inflation, casualties etc., this did not automatically make them become members of radical parties. **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 Level 2, but recognises that there were subtle changes of opinion as the war dragged on. The army's discipline and morale began to worsen. There was growing hostility to the influence of the Tsarina and Rasputin. Many of those who wanted change focused their hopes on the Duma or voluntary organisations, since a change of regime, especially during the war, seemed unthinkable. Answers may well recognise that by 1917 many left wingers had swung back to militancy, and there is a debate as to how much influence groups like the Bolsheviks had in the factories. However, when the revolution came in Spring 1917, it was not organised and grew quickly out of street protests which the forces of law and order ignored or joined. The spontaneous nature of the revolution caught revolutionaries unaware as much as anyone else. **6-7**

- (c) 'By February/March 1917 Tsarism was doomed, because it had lost the support of all sections of Russian society.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Indicative content

Answers will probably focus on the long term, short term and immediate causes of the February/March Revolution. It is legitimate to focus partly on longer term causes. For example, candidates might discuss long-term peasant grievances, dissatisfaction with the dumas, the legacy of the 1905 Revolution and so on. However, answers which focus mainly or totally on pre-1914 material are very unlikely to get above Level 2. Shorter term causes will focus essentially on the impact of the war years. There is a whole range of factors which account for the loss of support for the Tsar. There was the impact of frequent and heavy military defeats, leading to heavy casualties, loss of territory and serious blows to morale. This was not helped by the Tsar taking over personal command of the army. There was the loss of faith in the Tsar, and hostility to the Tsarina and Rasputin. There was the succession of incompetent ministers. There were the serious shortages on the home front, especially in the cities. There was the impact of inflation. There was growing opposition from within the Duma. Whilst not everyone necessarily thought in terms of a revolution, there was a growing loss of support for the Tsar at all levels of society. Even members of the aristocracy and leading politicians were thinking in terms of some sort of 'palace coup' by 1917. The Tsar could no longer count on the support of the military. Immediate factors behind the Revolution would include the impact of the winter, bread shortages in Petrograd, possibly the increase in left wing propaganda, the Tsar's inability to put down the Petrograd disturbances. Candidates may argue about when exactly the regime was 'doomed', if ever it was. The key factor was that few were prepared to support the Tsar any more when it came to the crunch – the arguments were less about whether he should go, than about what or who should replace him.

Answers at Level 1 will be generalised, possibly with some basic narrative or description of events. Level 2 answers will also probably be mostly descriptive, and whilst accurate in detailing loss of support, will not be developed on the 'why' or 'to what extent'. At Level 3 there will be an explanation of the causes of loss of support, and probably some discussion of the nature of the Revolution, but the answer will probably lack depth and balance. At Level 4 the analysis will be balanced and broad, and the answer will certainly develop the question of whether Tsarism was doomed. Level 5 answers will additionally contain sustained judgement on the nature of loss of support and the implications this had for Tsarism – and the answer will probably show good perspective.