

AS
HISTORY
7041/1H

Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855–1964

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

Mark scheme

June 2024

Version: 1.0 Final



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

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

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from [aqa.org.uk](https://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges 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 schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2024 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

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

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

Step 1 Determine a level

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

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

Step 2 Determine a mark

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

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

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

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

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these extracts and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two extracts provides the more convincing interpretation of the 'Great Reforms' and their impact by 1894?

[25 marks]*Target: AO3*

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate and challenge the interpretations/arguments/views.

In their identification of the argument in Extract A, students may refer to the following:

- this extract puts forward the overall interpretation that the ‘Great Reforms’ were far-reaching and successful
- it says that the reforms were the product of enlightened thinking in the government; it suggests a genuine desire ‘from above’ to reform and change society
- the extract argues that many freedoms were granted and the reforms successfully changed society: emancipation brought the development of peasant agriculture with increased peasant ownership of land; the base of local government was broadened and the zemstva countered backwardness and helped develop education; the state was completely remodelled.

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

- in support of interpretation: evidence of ‘enlightened thinking’ in government might include the St Petersburg Party of Progress/Milyutin brothers and ‘liberal’ influences on Alexander II, including leading family members, eg Grand Duchess Elena Pavlovna
- evidence can be cited to support the view that emancipation changed the basis of the economy: it provided opportunities for individual enterprise, movement and money-based capitalism. Other reforms (including local government, judicial, educational, military) brought positive (and in many cases) long-lasting changes: some representation at local level and consequent improvements to infrastructure; a fairer and less corrupt judicial system, with juries; a huge increase in primary education and a smaller but better-trained army)
- to challenge the interpretation: most reforms were limited in practice and traditional social structures and backwardness persisted; reforms were undermined by counter-reforms under Alexander III (and even before).

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

- overall, this extract suggests that the ‘Great Reforms’ were very limited and short-lived, since Alexander II abandoned reform from 1866 and Alexander III adopted an even more conservative stance
- it suggests the reforms were the product of defeat in the Crimean War (grudgingly conceded by a government that was anxious to preserve and increase its power)
- the extract argues that very little was conceded and reforms were ambiguous: the serfs remained tied to the land; the zemstva had no independence and the authority of the new courts was limited. The desire to preserve and increase central government power continued into the reign of Alexander III.

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

- in support of the interpretation: there is a clear link between failures in the Crimea (showing problems of serf army, social and economic backwardness and producing an escalation of serf uprisings) and the timing of the reforms
- evidence can be cited to support the view that the reforms were limited and some, such as the relaxation of censorship, short-lived. Alexander III introduced Land Captains (1889) who could over-ride the zemstva and reduced the peasant vote in the zemstva and town dumas; the use of military courts and closed court sessions undermined judicial changes
- to challenge the interpretation: the major reforms had a greater impact than this extract suggests; Alexander II only retracted a little after 1866. Emancipation made a huge impact: under Alexander III redemption fees were reduced, the peasants' land bank established and the Poll Tax abolished improving the peasants' lot further. Zemstva were a force of progress (particularly during the 1891–2 famine); central government control had been weakened by the existence of alternative sources of authority.

In arriving at a judgement as to which extract provides the more convincing interpretation, students might point out that both passages adopt extreme stances, but that Extract A is the more credible since it acknowledges the longer term implications of the reforms. However, it is possible to argue that Extract B is the more convincing because it is more realistic about the reforms' limitations and the attempts under both Alexander II and Alexander III to pull back from what had been attempted. Reward any substantiated judgement.

Section B

0 2 'Russia became an industrialised country in the years 1855 to 1894.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

Arguments supporting the view that Russia became an industrialised country in the years 1855 to 1894 might include:

- both Alexander II and III favoured industrial modernisation and the state played an active role in promoting industrial growth, particularly under Reutern (1862–78) and Vyshnegradsky (1887–92); foreign loans and expertise were used to establish new industry, eg oil extraction in Baku and ironworks in Donetsk
- agriculture was made to serve industry with high taxation and forced grain requisitions from 1880s; this helped change the balance of the economy
- there was a huge expansion of the railway network (annual average increase of 900 kms of railway 1861–1894), and much investment in heavy industry (mining, metal trades, oil)
- Russia was near to becoming the world's 4th largest industrial power by 1894 (achieved 1897).

Arguments challenging the view that Russia became an industrialised country in the years 1855 to 1894 might include:

- industrialisation was limited in scope and extent; it fell within specific regions of European Russia and factory production was small in scale; state-owned factories were mainly for armaments; Russia still lagged behind Western Europe and the gulf between potential (given resources and manpower) and actual achievement was huge
- Russia's industrial growth rate was no more than 'steady' (the 'great spurt' only came later); individual railway lines were of limited length and lighter industries, particularly textiles, remained more important than heavy industrial goods
- 80-90% people still lived off agriculture; small-scale farming dominated and Russia's main export was grain; there was limited internal demand (heavily taxed peasantry) to drive industrialisation; less than 2% population were urban workers
- Russia's financial services were insufficiently developed for an industrialised country; banking and company organisation was still primitive; much government expenditure was used to repay debt and the rouble varied in value.

Students are likely to balance the strengths and weaknesses of industrial change across the period in order to reach a judgement. The best might point out that 'industrialisation' is a relative concept and that whilst Russia had certainly started to industrialise, it was not a truly 'industrialised country' relative to Britain, for example. Others could argue that, by 1894, Russia had not developed the high standard of living and developed infrastructure that would perpetuate industrial growth and truly qualify it as an 'industrialised country'.

- 0 3** 'There was no significant change in tsarist political authority in Russia in the years c1900 to 1914.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**

Nothing worthy of credit.

Indicative content

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

Arguments supporting the view that there was no significant change in tsarist political authority in Russia in the years c1900 to 1914 might include:

- Tsar Nicholas II remained as head of government and retained his autocratic powers, as confirmed by the Fundamental Laws of 1906 which reaffirmed Divine Right
- the Council of Ministers (government) was appointed by the Tsar and the government remained responsible to the Tsar (not the Duma); all legislation had to receive the approval of the Tsar who could dissolve the Duma and by-pass it with little difficulty (able rule by decree in emergencies or when the Duma was not in session)
- government remained dominated by the nobility at central and local level; royal ministers mostly came from noble class; system of indirect voting to the Duma favoured nobility and their influence increased after changes to electoral arrangements before the 3rd Duma; government from 1905 had 2 chambers and half the members of the Upper Chamber were appointed by the Tsar
- the Tsar continued to head the army and navy and have authority to declare war and peace; the principles of Orthodoxy, autocracy and nationalism were still dominant; the traditional state institutions – bureaucracy, Church, military and police were unaltered.

Arguments challenging the view that there was no significant change in tsarist political authority in Russia in the years c1900 to 1914 might include:

- the unrest of c1900–1905 culminated in the October Manifesto which was itself a major concession, weakening the previously unquestioned political authority of the Tsar
- 1905/6 saw the establishment of a representative state Duma which had the power to approve laws; this was the basis for a constitutional monarchy and allowed for outright challenges to the political authority of the Tsar and his ministers
- the granting of civil rights (particularly of speech and assembly) and expansion in the powers of the zemstva weakened central tsarist control and undermined political authority
- the Dumas were consistently confrontational, making it difficult to implement tsarist political policies (eg Stolypin's agrarian, education and local government reforms); workers' strikes (with legalisation of unions from 1905) and direct action also challenged political authority.

Students are likely to conclude that, despite the dramatic events of 1905, there was no real devolution of power in these years. In 1914, government was as firmly fixed in the hands of the Tsar and his ministers as in 1900. It might, therefore, be argued that the apparent changes in the political structure after 1905 were insignificant, although some may see the change to a Duma government as of significance in exposing the weaknesses of the autocracy. The Tsarist government certainly struggled to retain its authority to 1914 and, by failing to accept and work with the new Dumas, was left in a weakened state to cope with further challenges posed by war.