

GCSE HISTORY

(8145)

Marked Papers 1A/C - Russia, 1894-1945
Tsardom and communism

Understand how to apply the mark scheme for our sample
assessment papers.

Version 1.0 April 2018

EXAMPLE RESPONSES



Example responses plus commentaries

The following student responses are intended to illustrate how the mark scheme can be interpreted and how it is likely that students will respond to the questions, allowing the student and teacher to explore and reflect upon the mark scheme and how answers can be improved.

Paper 1A/C

Russia, 1894–1945: Tsardom and communism

Question 01

Read **Interpretations A** and **B** from the Interpretations Booklet.

How does **Interpretation B** differ from **Interpretation A** about collectivisation?

Explain your answer using **Interpretations A** and **B**.

[4 marks]

Mark scheme

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full example answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target	Analyse individual interpretations (AO4a) Analyse how interpretations of a key feature of a period differ (AO4b)	
Level 2	Developed analysis of interpretations to explain differences based on their content	3–4
	Students may progress from a simple analysis of interpretations with extended reasoning to explain the differences. For example, Kopelev (B) emphasises that despite the appalling effects of the famine, collectivisation was justified because the ends would mean prosperity for all. By comparison students might explain the report (A) supports idea that collectivisation was a hate campaign that was going to be impossible to achieve.	
Level 1	Simple analysis of interpretation(s) to identify differences based on their content	1–2
	Students are likely to identify relevant features in each interpretation(s). For example, collectivisation, according to the special report (A), focused entirely on the desperate plight of people facing famine, whereas Kopelev (B) claims that collectivisation was justified.	
	Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question	0

Responses

Student one

Interpretation A and B are different about the reasons why the Soviet Union wanted collectivisation. Interpretation A says that it was about taking food from peasants and only happened because of 'a deliberate hate campaign against the peasants'. Interpretation B is different because it says that collectivisation was necessary to transform the countryside and make everyone better off. So A shows that collectivisation was only about getting food and crushing the peasants, while B says that it had bigger goals and had to happen to help the 'triumph of communism'.

Commentary – Level 2

The response shows developed analysis of both interpretations that explains how they differ about collectivisation. A relevant comparison is made and supported with reference to the content of both interpretations.

Student two

Interpretation A describes how collectivisation was for people. It shows what it was like and describes how people were starving because the Soviets had taken everything that they had and acted 'without mercy'. Interpretation B explains that people thought that collectivisation would lead to a 'great transformation' and that the goal of collectivisation was the Communism would triumph.

Commentary – Level 1

The answer shows simple analysis of both interpretations, identifying relevant differences about collectivisation with reference to their content. To progress, the answer should make a direct comparison explain how they are different about collectivisation.

Question 02

Why might the authors of **Interpretations A** and **B** have a different interpretation about collectivisation?

Explain your answer using the **Interpretations A** and **B** and your contextual knowledge.

[4 marks]

Mark scheme

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full example answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target	Analyse individual interpretations (AO4a) Analyse why interpretations differ (AO4c)	
Level 2	Developed answer analyses provenance of interpretation to explain reasons for differences	3–4
	<p>Students may progress from identification to explanation of the reasons for differences in the interpretations with extended reasoning supported by factual knowledge or understanding related to, for example, differences in provenance, context of their time of writing, place, previous experience, knowledge, beliefs, circumstances, and access to information, purpose and audience.</p> <p>For example, students argue that Interpretations A and B were based on different circumstances, beliefs and purposes; the then newly independent Ukrainian Parliament (Interpretation A) was marking the famine as an Anniversary and its anti-Soviet report exposed the cruelties of the country's old rulers. Kopelev (Interpretation B) was a keen young Communist ('True Believer') who was swept along by idealism in the Communist system at that time and so he tries to justify the idea that forced collectivisation was all for the best in the long run for the future of the Soviet State.</p>	
Level 1	Simple answers analyse provenance to identify reasons for difference(s)	1–2
	<p>Students are likely to identify relevant reasons for the differences in each interpretation(s). For example, Interpretation A was based on eye witness accounts of the famine; people who hated the Soviets.</p> <p>Interpretation B was by a young Communist believer, so he supported collectivisation enthusiastically.</p>	
	Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question	0

Responses

Student one

Interpretation A was written for the Ukrainian parliament on the 70th anniversary of a famine in Ukraine. It aims to show Ukrainians how bad the Soviet Union was for the country and its people by using eyewitness reports that describe Soviet cruelty to kulaks and other peasants who resisted. This helps to convince Ukrainians that they are better off being independent from the Soviet Union. On the other hand, interpretation B was written by someone who was an officer in charge of propaganda who wanted to show that people at the time believed that collectivisation was a good thing. He's writing many years after collectivisation and even though he knows that collectivisation had terrible effects on the people, like when falling production caused a famine in 1932, he wants to justify why people like himself helped collectivisation to happen.

Commentary – Level 2

The response shows developed analysis of both interpretations. Extended reasoning is shown in the explanation of the purposes of A and B with reference to the background and beliefs of the authors and times of writing. This is supported with relevant factual knowledge.

Student two

Interpretation A is a report published by the government of Ukraine about the bad effects of collectivisation on the people in the countryside, where millions of people died. It was written after Ukraine became independent, which meant that the writers could say what they wanted about the Soviets Union. Interpretation B was written by someone who was an officer in charge of propaganda when collectivisation took place who supported collectivisation. He wrote the interpretation much later, so he was able to say exactly what he thought to explain his opinions about collectivisation.

Commentary – Level 1

The response shows simple analysis of both interpretations, identifying reasons for difference related to the provenance of both interpretations. For interpretation A, the response identifies reasons related to the time and place of writing, while the analysis of B references the background of the author and context in which the interpretation was written. To progress, the response could explain the reasons for difference about collectivisation with reference to their respective purposes, supported with relevant factual knowledge.

Question 03

Which interpretation do you find more convincing about collectivisation?

Explain your answer using the **Interpretations A and B** and your contextual knowledge.

[8 marks]

Mark scheme

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full example answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target	Analyse individual interpretations (AO4a) Evaluate interpretations and make substantiated judgements in the context of historical events studied (AO4d)	
Level 4	Complex evaluation of interpretations with sustained judgement based on contextual knowledge/understanding Extends Level 3. Students may progress from a developed evaluation of interpretations by analysis of the relationship between the interpretations supported by factual knowledge and understanding. For example, the judgement that although both Interpretation A and B agree that collectivisation brought about significant hardship, Interpretation B is more convincing because it talks about the ideals and motivations behind the people who implemented the policy. By contrast Interpretation A seems to attribute the hardship to deliberate cruelty without consideration of the historical context that Russia needed to modernise its economy.	7–8
Level 3	Developed evaluation of both interpretations based on contextual knowledge/understanding Extends Level 2. Answers may assert one interpretation is more/less convincing. Students may progress from a simple evaluation of the interpretations by extended reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding. For example...supporting Interpretation B because of references to 1930s propaganda/communist ideology and/or the rationale for 'de-Kulakisation'.	5–6
Level 2	Simple evaluation of one interpretation based on contextual knowledge/understanding There may be undeveloped comment about the other interpretation.	3–4

Students may progress from a basic analysis of interpretations by supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, developing an argument supporting Interpretation A by reference to the numbers of people who died as a result of famine/the cruelties of collectivisation and/or the deliberate use of unrealistic quotas by Moscow to justify the seizures of grain.

Level 1 Basic analysis of interpretation(s) based on contextual knowledge/understanding 1–2

Answers show understanding/support for one/both interpretation(s), but the case is made by assertion/recognition of agreement.

For example, Interpretation A is convincing as forced collectivisation led to the millions of deaths from famine; Interpretation B is not convincing as young Communists had been brainwashed by Stalin's ideas.

Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question 0

Responses

Student one

Interpretation A is more convincing than B about the consequences collectivisation for peasants, particularly in Ukraine. Ukraine was the Soviet Union's best agricultural region, but collectivisation meant that the local communist leaders took far more grain than they did under NEP, which resulted in a large famine in 1932. The interpretation talks about how the Soviets acted without mercy, which is convincing because people who tried to hide food from the requisitions squads were treated terribly and often left to starve, while Kulaks who resisted were sent to labour camps or moved to poor quality land where nothing would grow.

Interpretation B is convincing for people who worked for the Communist party. The author believed that collectivisation was necessary to save help to transform the countryside and save communism. This was because the population was growing quickly before collectivisation was brought in. Most farms were too small to be able to use the new technology like tractors and fertilisers that would allow more food to be produced to feed the workers in the cities.

However, A is more convincing because it shows the opinion of peasants who hated collectivisation and did not agree that it was necessary. Most people in the USSR were peasants like in A, while B is only convincing for the small number of people who worked for the party and did not have 90% of their food taken off them.

Commentary – Level 4

The response shows complex evaluation of the interpretations. Relevant aspects of A and B are confirmed using accurate contextual knowledge and understanding. The response contextualises A and B, saying that A represents the larger group (the peasants in the countryside) and sustains a judgment with reference to the generality of the experience of collectivisation shown in A.

Student two

Interpretation A is convincing about Stalin's goals and the effects of collectivisation because it explains that Soviet actions were 'fuelled by a hate campaign against the peasants'. The Kulaks were wealthier peasants who owned their own land and refused to hand it over to the Communists, which made Stalin see them as a threat to the communist system. Therefore, A is right because Stalin tried to turn people against them by using anti-Kulak propaganda and punished the Kulaks by ordering requisition parties to take away their food which led to large famines in the countryside.

Interpretation B says that people thought that 'the ends justified the means', and that the people who carried out collectivisation thought that there would be a better future for all peasants once collectivisation was completed. This is convincing because Stalin thought that collectivising the farms would allow the country to grow what it needed in. However, overall A is more convincing than B because it talks about the reasons why collectivisation was popular with some people, while B is about the consequences of collectivisation for Kulaks and others who opposed Stalin's policies.

Commentary – Level 3

The answer addresses both interpretations, showing developed evaluation of A. Extended reasoning is shown in the use of relevant contextual knowledge and understanding of Stalin's motives and methods to confirm an aspect of the interpretation. The treatment of B shows simple reasoning, with the evaluation requiring further substantiation. A summative judgement is asserted. To progress beyond Level 3, the response should justify why A's account of collectivisation is more convincing.

Question 04

Describe two problems faced by Tsar Nicholas II's government in ruling Russia up to 1905.

[4 marks]

Mark scheme

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full example answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target	Demonstrate knowledge of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied (AO1a)	
	Demonstrate understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied (AO1b)	
Level 2	Answers demonstrate knowledge and understanding	3–4
	Students may progress from a simple demonstration of knowledge about the issues identified with extended reasoning supported by understanding of, for example, the ways in which events were problematic.	
	These might include:	
	One problem was that ruling Russia was difficult as the belief of some revolutionary groups in violent struggle created problems so the Tsar had to rely on the use of secret police to suppress them.	
	Another problem was the size of Russia and the huge extent of its problems, such as ancient farming practices and land holdings made modernisation difficult.	
Level 1	Answers demonstrate knowledge	1–2
	Students demonstrate relevant knowledge about the issue(s) identified which might be related to, for example, revolutionary groups were growing in numbers; people wanted better living and working conditions.	
	Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question	0

Response

Student one

One problem Tsar Nicholas faced was opposition groups. Whilst there was no criticism of the Tsar allowed, there were still those against him like the Socialist Revolutionaries. These were a problem for the Tsar because they had the support of the peasants, and they made up roughly 90% of the population in Russia, meaning that if they revolted it would be harder to stop. Another problem faced was the Trans-Siberian Railway. There was only one railway in the whole of Russia, meaning that the delivery of food and transportation was slow and if it broke down there could be revolts against the Tsar because of food shortages in the towns and cities.

Commentary – Level 2

Two problems relating to the issue in the question are identified. Understanding is demonstrated by showing how they were problems for the Tsar.

Student two

One problem faced by Tsar Nicholas was that he did not trust the people of Russia and tried to rule on his own like an autocrat which meant that little could get done. Another problem was that Russia was not industrialised properly before 1905 compared to other countries in Europe. This meant that Russia getting left behind by rival countries.

Commentary – Level 1

Knowledge of one problem faced by Tsar Nicholas II's government in ruling Russia is demonstrated (the Tsar's autocratic style). There is an attempt to show understanding, but this requires further support. The second problem is only implicitly relevant to the focus of the question.

Question 05

In what ways were the lives of people in Russia affected by the policies of the Provisional Government during 1917?

Explain your answer.

[8 marks]

Mark scheme

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full example answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target	Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order concepts (AO2:8) Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:8)	
Level 4	Complex explanation of changes Answer demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question Extends Level 3. Students may progress from a developed explanation of changes by explanation of the complexities of change arising from differences, such as time, group, social and/or economic impact, supported with knowledge and understanding. For example, the policies of the Provisional Government affected the urban and rural people differently. People living in urban areas starved because supply chains did not improve whereas the people living in rural areas decided to take matters into their own hands and seize the land themselves.	7–8
Level 3	Developed explanation of changes Answer demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question Extends Level 2. Students may progress from a simple explanation by developed reasoning considering two or more of the identified consequences, supporting them by factual knowledge and understanding. In addition to a Level 2 response, students make additional developed point(s). For example, the peasants were disappointed by the absence of land reforms, so they had to take matters into their own hands and seize land in order to redistribute holdings and boost food production.	5–6

For example, workers had hoped for the right to go on strike to improve working conditions, but the Provisional Government allowed factory owners the right to dismiss anyone who went on strike.

Level 2 Simple explanation of change 3–4

Answer demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Students may progress from a basic explanation of change by using simple reasoning and supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example, to **one** of the identified changes.

For example, the food shortages in the cities got worse because the Provisional Government failed to take measures to improve the food supply chains.

Level 1 Basic explanation of change(s) 1–2

Answer demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Students identify change(s), which are relevant to the question. Explanation at this level is likely to be implicit or by assertion.

For example, under the Provisional Government there were more food shortages.

Response

Student one

The Provisional Government affected the lives of different Russians in different ways. The government decided to continue fighting in the first world war, which meant that food was sent to the army rather than the starving workers in the city. They struggled to get food because the Provisional Government had not organised proper ways for it to be brought into towns from the Russian countryside. This affected their lives because prices rocketed and people were forced to queue for hours for things like bread, which made workers angry and more likely to join groups like the Bolsheviks who were promising peace, land and bread.

The government told the peasants in the countryside that they had to wait for land to be given to them until after elections were held because the government wanted decisions to be made democratically. This affected the peasants because they hoped that the February Revolution would improve their terrible living conditions in the mirs. Therefore, when the government took no action on land they saw that their living conditions would not change, which made many of them ignore the government's policies and take land without permission.

Commentary – Level 4

The response shows complex explanation of two changes. It is credited at Level 4 because it explains that different changes happened to different groups (urban workers and rural peasants), and supports the explanations with relevant knowledge and understanding.

Student two

One way that the Provisional government affected the lives of people in Russia was by continuing the war. The leader of the government was Kerensky and he promised Russia's allies in Britain and France that they would continue the war. This resulted in a disastrous attack on the Germany army in June 1917, which affected Russians because many soldiers decided to desert after the attack and come back to the countryside.

Another way in which people were affected is that people in the cities starved because there was no food. This meant that people had to queue for hours for small amounts of food like bread and the Provisional Government did not have any support from the general public, which affected the people negatively because they could not get enough food.

Commentary – Level 3

The response addresses more than one impact of the policies of the provisional government on the people of Russia, showing developed explanation of how the policy of continuing the war affected soldiers. This is supported with relevant and accurate factual knowledge and understanding. The second point is simple, containing a brief explanation of the consequences of poor food supplies on people in the cities. To improve this point, further reference the policies of the government is required.

To progress beyond Level 3, the response could explain the complexities of change by explaining, for example, how different groups of people in Russia were affected in different ways.

Question 06

Which of the following was the more important reason why Lenin was able to strengthen his rule over Russia:

- the Red Army
- economic policies?

Explain your answer with reference to **both** reasons.

[12 marks]

Mark scheme

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full example answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order concepts (AO2:6)

Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:6)

Examiners are reminded that AO1 and AO2 are regarded as interdependent and when deciding on a level should be considered together. When establishing a mark within a level, examiners should reward three marks for strong performance in both assessment objectives; two marks may be achieved by strong performance in either AO1 or AO2 and one mark should be rewarded for weak performance within the level in both assessment objectives.

Level 4 Complex explanation of both bullets leading to a sustained judgement 10–12

Answer demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Extends Level 3.

Students may progress from a developed explanation of causation by complex explanation of the relationship between causes supported by factual knowledge and understanding and arriving at a sustained judgement.

For example... students may conclude that the Red Army played a vital role in stabilising the country during a period of violence and without this control Lenin would have been unable to implement his economic policies, or that despite the success of the Red Army in defeating its enemies, its own supporters were turning against it by 1921, so without reform of the economy the Bolsheviks would have struggled to keep control.

Level 3	Developed explanation of both bullets	7–9
	Answer demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question	
	Extends Level 2	
	Students may progress from a simple explanation of causation with extended reasoning supported by developed factual knowledge and understanding.	
	For example...Lenin was able establish power over Russia was because of the impact the Red Army had in defeating the enemies of the Bolsheviks by winning the Civil War. Also its ability to suppress dissent such as the Kronstadt Rising. Economic policies in the form of the New Economic Policy also established control as they helped the economy to recover by stimulating production and thereby stabilising the country after the dislocation of the war, the Civil War and War Communism.	
Level 2	Simple explanation of bullet(s)	4–6
	Answer demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question	
	Students may progress from a basic explanation of causation by using simple reasoning and supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding	
	For example, Lenin’s power in Russia was strengthened by the work of the Red Army as they defeated the Whites and foreign armies in the Russian Civil War. The New Economic Policy was important in securing popular support for Lenin as production had slumped and there were shortages.	
Level 1	Basic explanation of bullet(s)	1–3
	Answer demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question	
	Students recognise and provide a basic explanation of one/both bullets.	
	For example, Lenin’s rule was stronger because the Red Army won the Civil War; his economic policies would help to reduce the food shortages.	
	Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question	0

Responses

Student one

The Red Army was the more important reason why Lenin was able to strengthen his rule over Russia. The Red army took control of cities like Moscow and Petrograd because they had over 300,000 men and were well organised under Trotsky. This allowed Lenin to strengthen his rule because the Red Army took control of factories in cities like Petrograd and Moscow, which meant that the Bolsheviks could control of manufacturing, which was important in defeating the Whites because it gave them more equipment and ammunition.

Economic policies like War Communism were important because it meant that the government could force peasants to give over all their surplus food and keep the army supplied. This meant that most of Russia's industry and agriculture ran on the rules he suggested. Also, after the Kronstadt sailors rebelled Lenin decided to bring in the New Economic Policy. This gave him the support of the peasants who suffered under War Communism by letting them make a profit from the food that they produced.

Overall, the most important factor was Red Army which was more important because they kept the population under strict control and forced them to follow Lenin's economic policies like War Communism. Without the Red Army to scare the peasants, War Communism would not have worked because the peasants would not have given over their food so easily, which helped Lenin to win the war.

Commentary – Level 4

The response shows complex explanation. The importance of both factors in strengthening Lenin's power is explained, with relevant and accurate knowledge used to support the points made. Complex explanation is shown in the concluding paragraph, where judgement about the most important factor is sustained by explaining how the actions of the Red Army allowed economic policies to take effect.

Student two

The Red Army gave Lenin control over Russia when the Red army was used to put down the Kronstadt rebellion. When a group of sailors began to revolt against the Bolsheviks Lenin sent Trotsky to Kronstadt, who used the Red Army to stop the rebellion by killing 1000 of the sailors. This sent a message to all anyone who would oppose him that Lenin was ruthless and would even kill his supporters if they opposed him.

However, the economic policies were also important. For example War Communism was needed to make sure the people and workers in the cities and the Red Army had enough food. Factories were also taken over by the Bolsheviks and free enterprise was banned. Even though War Communism was not popular with everyone, it gave Lenin more control because he controlled the food and factory production in Russia, which starved his enemies of power.

The Red Army was more important than economic policies because they crushed the Kronstadt rebellion and the helped Lenin to win the war. Economic policies were also important because they helped Lenin to control the factories, but they were not as important as the Red Army.

Commentary – Level 3

The response shows developed explanation of both factors. The issue in the question (how Lenin strengthened his rule in Russia) is directly addressed, and the points made are supported with relevant knowledge and understanding. A judgment is asserted in the conclusion but this is not sustained. To progress to Level 4, the response should justify why the Red Army was a more important factor in strengthening Lenin's rule.

Get help and support

Visit our website for information, guidance, support and resources at aqa.org.uk/8145

You can talk directly to the History subject team

E: history@aqa.org.uk

T: 0161 958 3861