



Cambridge Pre-U

HISTORY

9769/58

Paper 5h Special Subject: Russia in Revolution, 1905–1924

For examination from 2022

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 40

Specimen

This syllabus is regulated for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

This document has **8** pages. Blank pages are indicated.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Introduction

This assessment is designed to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material.

Generic guidance on using levels-based mark schemes

Marking of work should be positive, rewarding achievement where possible, but clearly differentiating across the whole range of marks, where appropriate.

The marker should look at the work and then make a judgement about which level statement is the best fit. In practice, work does not always match one level statement precisely so a judgement may need to be made between two or more level statements.

Once a best-fit level statement has been identified, use the following guidance to decide on a specific mark:

- If the candidate's work **convincingly** meets the level statement, award the highest mark.
- If the candidate's work **adequately** meets the level statement, award the most appropriate mark in the middle of the range.
- If the candidate's work **just** meets the level statement, award the lowest mark.

Assessment Objectives

AO1

Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately.

AO2

Showing understanding of appropriate concepts, investigate and respond to historical questions clearly and persuasively using an appropriate coherent structure to reach a substantiated and sustained judgement.

AO3

Analyse, interpret and evaluate source material and/or interpretations of the historical events studied.

Levels-based mark schemes

The levels-based mark schemes address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 2 and 3, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content for each question in the mark scheme.

Levels-based mark scheme for Question 1

Level	Level description	Mark
3	<p>Analyses both similarities and differences. Compares and contrasts the documents, integrating comments on both documents by content, theme or issue.</p> <p>Makes clear and well-supported comparisons of the content of the documents, and explores their themes and issues.</p> <p>Focuses consistently on the matter under discussion in the question.</p> <p>Analyses the extent to which the documents agree or disagree, and explains why with reference to their provenance.</p> <p>Demonstrates supported critical evaluation of both documents as historical evidence.</p>	8–10
2	<p>Describes the main similarities or the main differences and includes some reference to the alternative viewpoint.</p> <p>There may be some imbalance between comparison and contrast. At the lower end of the level, may treat the documents separately.</p> <p>Makes clear and supported comparisons of content, themes and issues.</p> <p>Deals largely with the matter under discussion, but use of the documents in relation to the question may be uneven.</p> <p>Some analysis of how far the documents agree or disagree. At the higher end of the level, there may be some explanation of why they might agree or differ, though the consideration of provenance will not be well developed.</p> <p>At the higher end of the level, demonstrates some critical evaluation of the documents as historical evidence.</p>	4–7
1	<p>Refers to some differences or similarities. May be uneven, for example, differences may be covered but not similarities or vice versa.</p> <p>Makes some comparison or contrast of content, themes or issues, but may be largely description or paraphrase. Likely to treat the documents separately.</p> <p>Makes reference to the wider topic but with limited focus on the specific matter under discussion in the question.</p> <p>Limited analysis of the extent to which the documents agree or disagree, though this may be implicit or asserted. Limited reference to provenance of the documents.</p> <p>At the lower end of the level, there may be simply description or paraphrase of the documents.</p>	1–3
0	No creditable response	0

Levels-based mark scheme for Question 2

Level	Analyse and interpret (AO3) 10 marks	Critically evaluate (AO3) and judgement in response to the question (AO2) 20 marks
5	9–10 marks Full analysis of all the documents as a set, interpreting them in relation to the question.	17–20 marks Well-sustained critical evaluation of evidence from the documents. Critical evaluation is well explained and supported throughout. Has a precise focus on the question. Coherent and developed judgement on the interpretation in the question, based on clear and persuasive evidence from the documents in their historical context.
4	7–8 marks Analyses all the documents, interpreting them in relation to the question, but some unevenness in depth or coverage of the documents.	13–16 marks Generally sustains a critical evaluation of evidence from the documents. Critical evaluation is mostly well explained and supported throughout. Has a broad focus on the question. Coherent judgement on the interpretation in the question, based on evidence from the documents in their historical context which is mostly clear and persuasive, but unevenly developed.
3	5–6 marks Some analysis of all the documents, with some interpretation of them in relation to the question. Uneven in depth of coverage of the documents with some omissions, description or irrelevance.	9–12 marks Some critical evaluation of evidence from the documents, but unevenly supported and explained. Generally coherent and contains some argument applicable to the question. Undeveloped judgement based predominantly on evidence from the documents which is occasionally clear and persuasive.
2	3–4 marks Limited analysis of the documents, with little interpretation of them in relation to the question. The depth of coverage of the documents will be very uneven, with significant omissions or evidence of misinterpretation of some documents, and with much description or irrelevance.	5–8 marks Limited critical evaluation of the evidence from the documents. Generalised critical comments with limited support and uneven explanations. Generally coherent and introduces argument which is mostly relevant to the topic. Attempts a judgement but offers limited supporting evidence from the documents.
1	1–2 marks Describes or paraphrases the documents. Little or no analysis and there may be major omissions of documents and very limited reference to the question. Answers reveal serious misinterpretation of the documents.	1–4 marks Little critical evaluation of evidence from the documents. Has some coherence. Few parts of the response are relevant. It responds to some of the issues raised by the topic. No judgement beyond simple and unsupported assertions or relies on description of the documents.
0	0 marks No creditable response	0 marks No creditable response

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p>Compare and contrast the evidence in Documents A and B for the policy of Nicholas II towards political change. You should analyse the content and provenance of both documents.</p> <p>Answers should make full use of both documents and be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. Where appropriate, answers should demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation and awareness of the context by using not only the text but also headings and attributions.</p> <p>Similarities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both come as declarations from the Tsar and are similar in that both say that laws need the approval of the Duma. • Document A refers to civil freedoms and Document B confirms this to an extent by reference to the right to organise societies and unions, and religious freedom. <p>Differences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document A says that the Tsar will be bound by laws and will not act in an arbitrary way, but Document B suggests an autocrat answerable only to God. • Document B is about the powers of the Tsar and Document A, while not specifically reducing these, puts emphasis on the rights of the subjects. • The freedom of conscience, speech and assembly in Document A is limited in Document B by societies and unions not being for purposes contrary to law, and the law is what the Tsar decides. • The tone of the two documents is very different. <p>Provenance:</p> <p>As Document A says, the motivation for this declaration is concern about disturbances, and the need to divide the revolutionaries by making concessions which will appeal to the middle classes is clear. By 1906, the immediate danger of revolution is over, and the tone and intention are different. Now, the motivation is to reassert the power of the Tsar at a time when royal authority under Stolypin is making a comeback.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>How convincing is the evidence provided in this set of documents that Kerensky was responsible for his own downfall in October 1917? In evaluating the documents, you should refer to all the documents in this set (C–F).</p> <p>Main issue:</p> <p>The discussion is about whether Kerensky brought about his own downfall by an unwise conspiracy with Kornilov and allowing the Bolsheviks to become too powerful or whether the circumstances of unrest in the army and the actions of both Kornilov and the Bolsheviks put him in an impossible position.</p>	30

Question	Answer		Marks
2	Analysis of interpretation in documents (AO3)	Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)	
	<p>Document C suggests that Kerensky had let himself be dominated by the Soviet with its Bolshevik majority to act in accord with the plans of Germany to weaken the war effort. This would indicate that Kerensky was to blame for discrediting the government and bringing about the circumstances of a military coup. The efforts to maintain the war made in June belie this and many in the Soviet did not approve a peace policy, though Lenin of course did – something that did not always mean greater popularity. What is interesting is the reference to the Constituent Assembly and candidates may pick up on that as an indication of some weakness in Kerensky in not expediting this.</p>	<p>Document C: The origin of the document is an appeal by a general intent on restoring conservative rule so may be exaggerating the failures of Kerensky and there is no hint of negotiations between them. What is justified is the failure of Kerensky to put in place a constitution – something Kornilov says he intends to do by calling a constituent assembly.</p>	
	<p>Document D: Kerensky here is seen as approving the coup and having an agreement with Kornilov. Either this can be seen as a decisive action which might have prevented the October revolution or, more likely, an unwise encouragement of a military coup which in the end gave the Bolsheviks the key opportunity to get popular support, arm its supporters and take power to save the February revolution. Kornilov claimed to be acting on Kerensky's instructions; Kerensky painted Kornilov as a counter-revolutionary who wanted to install himself as a military dictator.</p>	<p>Document D: Though this is from a first hand position as a member of the committee of investigation, this was published many years afterwards under Soviet rule. No conclusive evidence has emerged to support either Kornilov's or Kerensky's claims. Candidates may know that Kerensky had increased military disciplinary measures in June 1917 and had agreed to martial law in principle, possibly leading Kornilov to think that the new coalition government would accept a military regime. But Kerensky quickly condemned Kornilov's dispatch of troops to the capital. It would be natural for Kornilov to claim that he was not acting independently, but in the support of the government. The tape has not survived.</p>	

Question	Answer		Marks
2	Analysis of interpretation in documents (AO3)	Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)	
	Document E gives the impression of the affair being crucial to Kerensky's failure, leading to agitation by the Bolsheviks who had been 'impotent' before. This suggests that he had been able to control them, but the coup made a 'fatal link' to the revolution.	The sudden upsurge of anarchy and revolt following the coup should be seen in a wider context of some failures by Kerensky and the Provisional Government, and the limited willingness of people to support it in October. Written in exile this might seem to be exonerating himself too much. It is true that the July days had been suppressed and Lenin exiled, but the support for Bolshevism had been growing and Lenin had produced powerful propaganda which revealed Kerensky's failures to deliver 'peace, bread and land'.	
	Document F supports the view that Kerensky was responsible for his downfall from a different perspective. Pipes argues that Kerensky did not see the threat of Bolshevism and did not deal with it decisively enough in August, being too worried about the threat of a potential ally, 'he lost a unique opportunity'.	Document F: Given Pipes's general hostility to Lenin and his Cold War concerns, this may be special pleading. However, candidates do not need to know who Pipes was and their argument should be considered in its own terms. It is true that Kerensky was decisive in July but allowed the Bolsheviks to take advantage of the coup, and contextual knowledge may support this. However, the threat of military dictatorship should not be underplayed given the events of August 1917.	
<p>Possible judgements (AO2):</p> <p>The documents do produce some damning indictments of Kerensky which might form the basis of a hostile judgement – that he failed to deal decisively with the Bolsheviks (Document F) and that he failed in war (Document C); that he was instrumental in bringing about the Kornilov coup which was so important in allowing the Bolsheviks to emerge as the key defenders of the revolution (Document D).</p> <p>Kerensky's defence might be the basis of a judgement if these views were seen as unreliable or special pleading. As Kerensky says in Document E, Kornilov's coup did make for a difficult situation and the Bolsheviks were adept at taking advantage of very difficult circumstances. Kerensky did face anarchy at the front which he had inherited from Tsarist mismanagement of the war.</p>			