

Examiner's General Advice on Unit 1

Students in this AS unit are expected to demonstrate three particular skills:

- There is the ability to select, use and communicate accurate knowledge and understanding of the topic.
- When giving a historical explanation, there is the ability to make a substantiated judgement, that is, a judgement that goes beyond mere assertion and is backed up by appropriate evidence.
- There is the ability to interpret, evaluate and use a range of source material, both primary and secondary, and also explain and evaluate interpretations of the topics studied.

These skills are also **assessment objectives**. All questions will aim to test more than one of these objectives, and in an examination answer will be marked accordingly. On any given examination paper, there will be a planned balance of the various skills across questions to ensure that all are covered. However, individual questions or part questions will focus on certain skills, not necessarily all of them at once. One of the ways of writing an effective answer is therefore to learn to recognise the particular skill that is the focal point of a particular question. However, it is also important to remember that accurate knowledge and understanding are key elements in any AS answer. Generalised statements showing, for example, a student's awareness that one piece of evidence is less objective and more biased than another will not earn much credit. There must also be a clear indication of some background knowledge and understanding of the topic in addition to the ability to make comparisons and contrasts between the sources.

Unit 1 (options A-N) contains **three** 2-part questions, and candidates have to answer two of the three questions (both parts).

AQA – AS GCE
Change and
Consolidation
Unit 1 HIS1H

Tsarist Russia, 1855–1917

**QUESTION 1
(01)**

Examiner's Specific Advice

This question is testing your knowledge and your ability to communicate it effectively. It is important that you do both. The key words in this exemplar question are 'Explain why', 'failed' and 'satisfied reformers'. It is not enough just to describe events – that will earn very few marks. You need to explain the reasons why the Dumas did not satisfy reformers, and if possible make links between the reasons, showing perspective and understanding. If you do that well, you should get a high level. There is no need to write a full essay – two or three paragraphs should be sufficient.

Exemplar Question

Access to History Online AQA Change and Consolidation – Tsarist Russia, 1855–1917 – AS
Question

1 (01) Explain why the first two Dumas failed to satisfy reformers in Russia.

[12 marks]

Plan

- Identify context of the Dumas – why they were set up
- What the Dumas did
- Why reformers were not satisfied
- Conclusion – any links?

Examiner's Exemplar Answer 1

The first Duma was in 1906. It didn't do much because Tsar Nicholas II did not really believe in it, but he had promised a parliament as a way of stopping the 1905 Revolution (1). The Revolution had been caused by several incidents such as Bloody Sunday and the Potemkin mutiny. Nicholas issued the October Manifesto which promised reform, including people voting for a Duma (2). But he had no faith in it and wanted to keep his absolute power (3).

Examiner's Assessment

Overall this is a relevant answer, apart from time wasted on a brief narrative of part of the 1905 Revolution, which could have been briefly mentioned at the start in order to provide a context for the answer. The answer is very undeveloped. Nothing is said about the second Duma. Two reasons are suggested for dissatisfaction – the Duma did little and the Tsar would not let it affect his power – but there is no development, no recognition of what the reformers actually wanted, no linking of reasons or overall judgement. The answer merits Level 2 because there is relevant knowledge. However, it is low Level 2 because of the limitations mentioned.

Examiner's Exemplar Answer 2

In theory the creation of the Dumas should have satisfied liberal reformers in Russia because they had long demanded constitutional reform which would have made the Tsar share his power with an elected parliamentary assembly. Hard-line radicals like Social Democrats would never have been satisfied with a parliament because they wanted revolutionary political and social change (4).

Basically the first Dumas did not work effectively because the Tsar never intended them to. He had promised reform in the October Manifesto in order to split the opposition which emerged in the 1905 Revolution, on Witte's advice (5). But the Fundamental Laws issued shortly afterwards clearly set out his refusal to reduce his autocratic power. He kept a veto, could dissolve the Duma, and his ministers were responsible only to the Tsar himself. Many of the Upper House members were not elected, but chosen instead. Only rich landowners could vote directly for MPs, the others were elected through electoral colleges. It was in no way democratic (6).

Even so the Dumas were more radical than the Tsar expected. Whilst the Kadets proposed reforms such as land reform and progressive income tax, which would have satisfied some reformers, other deputies demanded more. The Tsar closed the Duma after two months. The reformers showed their dissatisfaction when the Kadets went to Finland and issued the

(1) There is a legitimate reason for reformers' dissatisfaction here, albeit scarcely developed.

(2) This brief section is not very effective, because it becomes a narrative of the 1905 Revolution, rather than answering the specific question.

(3) Another reason for dissatisfaction is mentioned – the Tsar's determination to remain an autocrat – but again it is not developed.

(4) This is a solid beginning, because the candidate shows secure own knowledge, setting out the context in which the Dumas were created and what they were about.

(5) This develops a reason for dissatisfaction, the fact of the Tsar's lack of good faith.

(6) This section effectively develops other reasons for dissatisfaction – the way the Duma was structured and its limited power.

Vyborg Manifesto in protest. Many of them were arrested (7).

The second Duma was also a disappointment. When left-wing deputies made radical demands, Nicholas closed it down (8).

Whilst the Duma might be seen as a step forward – since at the very least, political parties could now legally exist – the Dumas had achieved no major changes of the sort which would have really satisfied reformers, who quickly realised that the Tsar still had autocratic power (9).

(7) There are more examples of effective use of knowledge here – the fact that the Duma was closed, and the protests that showed dissatisfaction.

(8) Yet another reason is mentioned and very briefly developed.

(9) This is an effective conclusion, because it sets the whole issue in context – linking the reality of limited change, which was something for the reformers to cling to, but also showing understanding of how this first Duma period did not meet their hopes and expectations.

Examiner's Assessment

Whilst not a 'perfect' answer, it is a very good one. It meets the relevant criteria, by briefly developing several reasons for dissatisfaction, using a good combination of knowledge and analysis, and it draws a legitimate conclusion which shows judgement. The answer is relevant throughout. It merits Level 4.

Mark Scheme	
L1:	
The answer is descriptive and only loosely linked to the question, or there is comment but with little support. It is likely to be assertive and generalised.	[1–2 marks]
L2:	
There will be some relevant knowledge and understanding, but the answer will be mainly descriptive about the Dumas, with few links to the issue of how they were regarded by reformers; or explanations will show limited range and/or depth.	[3–6 marks]
L3:	
Answers will show good understanding, with relevant explanations (at least two developed ones) of why the first two Dumas did not satisfy reformers, using appropriate knowledge, although the answer may not cover all aspects.	[7–9 marks]
L4:	
The answer will be well focused on the issue of how the Dumas were regarded by reformers, with a range of explanations, backed up with precise evidence and probably showing a good awareness of links/connections.	[10–12 marks]

Examiner's Specific Advice

This question is testing several skills and also your knowledge of the topic. Because the question is on an important topic, you are expected to know the main details, in this case the development of Russian agriculture. You are also being required to provide a historical explanation and make a substantiated judgement.

As always with an essay-type question, relevance is the key – your answer can be reasonably concise as long as you address the precise question. Relevance is more important than elegance of style – do not over worry about presenting your work with neat introductions and conclusions, especially if you are writing under examination conditions.

The key thing is not to narrate and describe, but keep the precise question in mind: to what extent was agriculture improved between 1894 and 1914, and what was the role of the Tsarist regime in this? It is possible to adopt a chronological approach in answering this question. It is also possible to take the situation in 1894 and compare it with the situation in 1914, and then analyse and explain what happened between these dates. Another approach would be to take each strand of agriculture in turn and focus on that issue, before pulling the threads together.

Most importantly, whatever the approach, do make a judgement and back it up with evidence, either with a concluding paragraph or throughout the essay.

You might find it advisable for an essay-type answer of this sort to have a plan, since you will almost certainly be writing several paragraphs.

Exemplar Question

1 (02) How successful was Nicholas II's regime in improving agriculture by 1914?
[24 marks]

Plan

- Introduction – Russian agriculture in 1894
- Situation of agriculture in 1914
- Backwardness of the rural economy
- The Stolypin reforms and their impact
- Conclusion

Examiner's Exemplar Answer 1

Nicholas II was partially successful in improving agriculture by 1914, mainly due to his minister Stolypin, after the 1905 Revolution. Stolypin knew that farming was not productive and that peasants did not have the knowledge or means to improve (1). He passed laws which allowed the peasants to improve the land by leaving the mir and farming the land as they wanted. Instead of having the mir re-allocating their land and telling peasants what to grow, they could organise for themselves. This gave them an incentive to improve (2).

(1) This is a relevant beginning, although so far only one problem has been identified, and not explained in any depth.

Not all peasants took advantage of this. Those who did sometimes became well off and became known as kulaks. However, much of the farming was still backward with few machines, whilst poor land and climate were problems in many areas. Therefore agriculture only partially improved (3).

(2) This is an accurate description of part of Stolypin's reforms, although as yet there is no evaluation.

Examiner's Assessment

This is not a strong answer. It is relevant, and linked to the question. However, it is a very partial answer. Whilst brevity does not automatically mean a weak answer, in this case the candidate has not explored anything in depth: there are some generalisations about the problems (for example, were all farming areas equally unproductive?) and explanations are very limited. There is little evidence of developed understanding or depth of knowledge. The answer merits Level 2, because it is more than a generalised response, it is linked to the question and is reasonably explicit, but it has limited support and evaluation/judgement is quite limited.

(3) There is some balance and a very brief evaluation at the end, but it is very limited.

Examiner's Exemplar Answer 2

When Nicholas II came to the throne in 1894 agriculture was one of the weakest sectors of the Russian economy. Despite the emancipation of the serfs in 1861, farming in many areas, apart from better areas like Black Earth Russia, was dogged by poor quality land and problems of a harsh climate, and too little land existed to feed a rapidly growing population. A poorly educated and poorly equipped peasantry had little incentive to improve, because they lacked security of landholding, and most peasants were in debt (4).

(4) This is a good opening paragraph. It shows good use of knowledge, clearly outlining the situation in 1894.

What had changed by 1914? Not much. A minority of peasants had taken advantage of opportunities to consolidate their land-holdings into single blocks, and grow what they liked without interference from the mir. In some cases peasants had opened up 'new' areas like Siberia. But for most peasants, even when free from debt, life was hard. By the standards of the more developed world, Russian farming was primitive. One

(5) This is an

Access to History Online AQA Change and Consolidation – Tsarist Russia, 1855–1917 – AS Question

of the few improvements by 1914 was that the worst of the famines which had afflicted Russia in the late nineteenth century were over (5).

Little changed in the first half of Nicholas' reign, because he was never a reformer. Also the main emphasis of economic development, especially under Witte, was on expanding industry, with the intention of making Russia a stronger power in Europe. Neglect of agriculture was evident in 1905, when many peasants joined in the 1905 disturbances because they resented the burden of redemption payments and the high taxes. A Peasant Union held a congress to demand common ownership of land instead of private ownership – a form of peasant socialism (6).

Those involved in disturbances suffered, because after the Revolution was defeated the new Chief Minister Stolypin had many peasant rioters and rebels court-martialled and hanged. However, Stolypin was intelligent enough to realise that repression alone would not solve 'the peasant problem'. The Government made important concessions: in January 1906 redemption payments were reduced, and then abolished altogether in January 1907. This pacified peasants, although alone this measure would not significantly improve agriculture (7).

Stolypin went further, although he rejected radical demands for compulsory redistribution of land. Laws passed in 1906, 1910 and 1911 allowed peasants to separate their land from the mir, under the supervision of elected local commissions which included peasant representatives. New farmland was colonised in Siberia and Central Asia, producing a range of products. There were other reforms such as cooperatives which gave peasants credit; and there was more use of machinery and fertilisers to improve productivity. However, as indicated earlier, only a minority of peasants (probably as low as ten per cent) took advantage of Stolypin's reforms, partly because many peasants were conservative by nature and slow to change (8).

It is also noteworthy that Stolypin's motives had been less about improving productivity than creating a more stable, satisfied peasant class which would be more loyal to the regime. Even in this he was only partially successful, because peasants still had grievances. The concessions since 1894 had been welcome enough, but were not enough to make Russian agriculture modern and productive, particularly since apart from issues of ownership and organisation, others to do with modernisation and the quality of land made it difficult to overcome major problems such as infertility and climate extremes. This is why some historians debate the degree of success which Stolypin enjoyed before his assassination. Agriculture remained a major 'problem' for Russia in 1914, despite the fact that it remained the backbone of the Russian economy until the industrialisation of the USSR in the 1930s (9).

equally effective paragraph because by moving immediately to 1914, the candidate identifies issues of continuity and change, and is already beginning to develop a judgement.

(6) This shows good use of own knowledge to further explain the problems and issues in agriculture.

(7) This is a balanced paragraph, because it examines Stolypin's role, with some evaluation.

(8) Although there is quite a lot of narrative/description in this paragraph, it is valid, because it is used to support the argument for limited improvement rather than just for information's sake.

(9) This is an effective conclusion to the answer. There is quite a lot of evaluation, supported by more evidence, and there is a judgement which is balanced and shows good perspective.

Examiner's Assessment

This is an effective answer. It does not cover all possible aspects but does not have to. What is there, is confidently presented, and combines sound knowledge with analysis and some judgement throughout. The question is directly addressed. There is balance and, by implication, an awareness of interpretations, since there is a debate about how significant Stolypin's reforms were. The answer is worth Level 5.

Mark Scheme
L1: The answer is descriptive, only loosely linked to the question, or only answering part of it, or it is an explicit answer with little or no effective support. The answer is likely to be generalised and possibly assertive rather than argued. [1–6 marks]
L2: The answer shows some understanding of the development of Russian agriculture between 1894 and 1917. It may be predominantly descriptive about this development, with some links to the question of the role of the Tsarist regime, or it may have explicit links with relevant but limited support. [7–11 marks]
L3: The answer shows developed understanding of the role of the Tsarist regime in the development of agriculture. There will be some assessment, supported by relevant and well-selected knowledge, although there will probably be a lack of weight of detail and/or balance. There will be some understanding of interpretations. [12–16 marks]
L4: There is explicit understanding of the impact of the Tsarist regime on agriculture between 1894 and 1914. A balanced argument will be supported by good use of evidence and understanding of interpretations. [17–21 marks]
L5: Answers will be well focused and closely argued. The arguments about how successfully the Tsarist regime developed agriculture in this period will be supported by precisely chosen evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating a well-developed understanding of interpretations and debate. [22–24 marks]

Examiner's Specific Advice

This question is testing your knowledge and your ability to communicate it effectively. It is important that you do both. The key words are 'Explain why', 'possible threat', 'Petrograd Soviet' and 'Provisional Government'. It is not enough just to describe events – that will earn very few marks. You need to explain the reasons why the Soviet was a possible threat to the Government, and if possible make links between the reasons, showing perspective and understanding. If you do that well, you should get a high level. There is no need to write a full essay – two or three paragraphs should be sufficient.

Exemplar Question

2 (a) Explain why the Petrograd Soviet was a possible threat to the Provisional Government in the aftermath of the February/March Revolution.

[12 marks]

Plan

- Nature of the Soviet and the PG, and how they were established
- Threats posed by the Soviet to the PG's authority
- Conclusion – links between reasons

Examiner's Exemplar Answer 1

The Petrograd Soviet was a council of workers, soldiers and sailors elected at the time of the February Revolution. There had been Soviets before, especially during the 1905 Revolution (1). The Soviet was a threat to the Government because it demanded control of the army, which was particularly important because the First World War was still going on (2). It also wanted other reforms. Because the Soviet had a lot of influence, it was bound to appear a threat to the Provisional Government (3).

Examiner's Assessment

Overall the answer has some relevance but it is not an effective answer. Really only one reason for a possible 'threat' is given, and it is scarcely developed. There is some assertion rather than explanation, and there is little indication that the candidate knows or understands much about the topic. The answer edges into a low Level 2 because, although weak, there is evidence of limited relevance and knowledge.

Examiner's Exemplar Answer 2

The Petrograd Soviet was an implicit threat to the Provisional Government in the immediate aftermath of the February/March Revolution because of the nature of the two institutions. The Provisional Government contained influential people, some of whom had served under the Tsar. Some had been Duma deputies, and Prince Lvov and Milykov had held important positions. Nevertheless, the Government had a weakness in that it was not elected, but had appointed itself in an uncertain period (4). In contrast, the Soviet was formed in February by groups of socialist intellectuals, factory workers and soldiers, and its Executive Committee was elected. Therefore it claimed to be more representative than the Government (5).

Possibly the Soviet could have seized power, but held back for two reasons. Some leading figures in the Soviet feared that use of force would create more disorder, which would benefit nobody. Secondly, most socialists believed the Marxist doctrine that a middle-class revolution (represented by the Provisional Government taking power) had to take place before the working class could develop and eventually be part of a genuine socialist revolution. It was a close-run thing, because some extreme left-wing members of the Executive Committee did call for an immediate revolution, and so the threat was real (6).

(1) This is useful knowledge about the context of the Soviet, but so far it has not been linked to the actual question.

(2) This is a legitimate reason to explain a threat, but the point about the First World War and why the Soviet wanted control of the army needs developing.

(3) This is a weak ending. It is just an assertion, with no evidence about *why* there was a threat.

(4) The candidate uses knowledge well to explain a particular weakness of the Government.

(5) Again, the answer develops a comparative strength/weakness between the two institutions.

(6) This is very good use of knowledge, showing a good understanding of the political complexities at the time, and the

Access to History Online AQA Change and Consolidation – Tsarist Russia, 1855–1917 – AS Question

The Soviet was also a threat because it was well organised. For example, it ran a newspaper – *Izvestia*. It also had influential members like Alexander Kerensky, a member of the Executive Committee, who was also in the Provisional Government and was eventually to lead it. Although there was a 'Dual Alliance' between the two organisations, the Soviet had more power because it controlled the army and its Order Number One demanded that any orders from the Government to the army had to be approved by the Soviet first (7).

Although some historians claim that the Government did not feel threatened, it was not so obvious at the time, because the Soviet did have all the above things in its favour immediately after the Revolution, and it continued to be an important body during 1917, as well as having a pedigree going back to the 1905 Revolution (8).

candidate uses the information to evaluate the seriousness of the threat.

(7) This is further good development of another factor in the 'rivalry' between the two bodies.

(8) An effective final paragraph, which pulls the arguments together and shows some perspective.

Examiner's Assessment

This is a strong answer. The candidate shows depth and range of relevant knowledge, used confidently to explain a number of reasons why the Soviet appeared to be a threat. There is a lot of evaluation and balanced judgement also, and the answer shows good links and perspectives. It merits Level 4.

Mark scheme
L1:
The answer is descriptive and only loosely linked to the question, or there is comment but with little support. It is likely to be assertive and generalised. [1–2 marks]
L2:
There will be some relevant knowledge and understanding, but the answer will be mainly descriptive about the Soviet and/or Provisional Government, with few links explaining their relationship; or explanations will show limited range and/or depth. [3–6 marks]
L3:
Answers will show good understanding, with relevant explanations (at least two developed ones) of why the Soviet appeared to be a threat to the Provisional Government, using appropriate knowledge, although the answer may not cover all aspects. [7–9 marks]
L4:
The answer will be well focused on the issue of how the Soviet appeared to be a threat to the Provisional Government, with a range of explanations, backed up with precise evidence and probably showing a good awareness of links/connections. [10–12 marks]

Examiner's Specific Advice

This question is testing several skills and also your knowledge of the topic. Because the question is about a major theme, you are expected to know the main details, in this case the responsibility for the October Revolution. You are also being required to provide a historical explanation and make a substantiated judgement.

As always with an essay-type question, relevance is the key – your answer can be reasonably concise as long as you address the precise question. Relevance is more important than elegance of style – do not over worry about presenting your work with neat introductions and conclusions, especially if you are writing under examination conditions.

The key thing is not to narrate and describe, but keep the precise question in mind: to what extent was weakness in the Provisional Government responsible for its overthrow? Clearly your answer should evaluate the extent to which the Provisional Government was responsible for its own overthrow. However, in assessing 'How far?' you will probably want to evaluate any other factors which contributed to the Revolution, for example Lenin's role, before reaching a final judgement.

Most importantly, whatever the approach, do make a judgement and back it up with evidence, either with a concluding paragraph or throughout the essay.

You might find it advisable for an essay-type answer of this sort to have a plan, since you will probably be writing several paragraphs.

Exemplar Question

2 (04) How far was the lack of effective government responsible for the outcome of the October/November Revolution?

[24 marks]

Plan

- Introduction – context of Revolution in October/November
- Main developments since the spring
- Strengths and weaknesses of the PG
- Other factors: the War; the Bolsheviks; economic problems
- Conclusion

Examiner's Exemplar Answer 1

The Provisional Government was not effective in governing Russia and it was not surprising that it was overthrown in another revolution. The Government was not strong. It had not been elected, which might not have mattered had it been successful, but it wasn't. It allowed Lenin back into Russia and released political prisoners. It decided to continue the War, because the Government was under pressure from its allies, Britain and France, and was desperate for success. However, there were more defeats by the Germans. Therefore the Government was not effective in war, and it could not stop many Russian soldiers from deserting (1).

(1) This is a solid introduction. It gets to grips with the question and introduces some reasons why the PG was not in a good position.

There were other problems such as shortages of food, affecting people behind the Front Line. These problems had existed before February 1917, but the Government was no better than the Tsarist regime in solving them. The Government also failed to carry out its promise to hold elections (2).

(2) This paragraph, using sound knowledge, continues the theme of the previous paragraph.

Kerensky was not an effective leader. He had to rely on the Bolsheviks when his Government was threatened by the Kornilov revolt. Kornilov was stopped by the Bolsheviks, not the Government. When the Bolsheviks finally attacked the Winter Palace, the Government had practically no force to stop them. The Bolsheviks were 'kicking at an open door'. Enthusiasm for the Government had long gone (3).

(3) There is more valid information and basic analysis in this final paragraph. However, there is not much development of some of the key points, and although the conclusion contains some hints of judgement, it is not developed.

Examiner's Assessment

This is a valid answer to the question. It is relevant, and linked to the question. The knowledge shown is accurate. However, in some ways it is a limited answer. The candidate has not explored anything in depth: for example, the answer barely touches upon other factors such as the role of the Bolsheviks, which also contributed to the Revolution. The answer merits Level 3, because there is some appropriately selected evidence and some assessment. Limited depth prevents it from reaching the higher levels.

Examiner's Exemplar Answer 2

The October/November Revolution was due to several factors. The growing ineffectiveness of the Provisional Government was certainly one of them, and possibly the most important reason, because that ineffectiveness made other factors such as the determined leadership of the Bolsheviks all the more significant (4).

(4) This is a solid introduction to the question, already moving into analysis.

The Provisional Government had the advantage at first of a lot

Access to History Online AQA Change and Consolidation – Tsarist Russia, 1855–1917 – AS Question

of goodwill, but then it soon faced major challenges, since there was an unsuccessful war going on. None of the problems was necessarily fatal had the Government been more effective. However, it proved increasingly ineffective. The Government's failures left a power vacuum which could have had several possible outcomes: complete anarchy, or possibly a right-wing military takeover as almost happened under Kornilov; or possibly a coup of the sort which eventually happened with Lenin's Bolsheviks (5).

(5) The candidate shows a good level of knowledge, but also combines it with analysis and evaluation.

The Provisional Government was not very effective in dealing with its rivals. It was not overthrown by the Soviet, but that was more because of divisions within the Soviet's leadership and its readiness to give the Government a chance to govern than because of the Government's own decisiveness or effectiveness. When the Government did act, as in releasing political prisoners who included its opponents, the action sometimes rebounded against itself. Also it did not resolve the problem of being a coalition government, leading to splits. Kerensky, for all his vanity and posturing, was not a decisive leader. The Government did not overcome the disadvantage of being unelected, because although it promised elections to an assembly, they were postponed, and so the Government had a certain lack of natural authority (6).

(6) This paragraph combines knowledge and analysis well.

The Government did not solve the problem of the war. Admittedly this was a major problem, because Russian armies had consistently done badly against superior German forces, and there was not the military leadership or other improvements that could have turned the tide. Failure in war meant an inability to solve related problems such as economic strains and depressed morale. Postponing land reform because of war priorities might have seemed a rational decision, but it lost the Government further support from the land-hungry peasantry (7).

(7) This paragraph continues the solid analysis and supported evaluation of the previous paragraph.

The Provisional Government was not necessarily doomed to failure, although Soviet historians often claimed it was. Some western historians have been less certain, although they do tend to accept that the problems facing the Government were daunting (8). The Government showed that it could on occasions act decisively and successfully, as when it averted a major crisis during the July Days demonstrations. Kerensky then showed the other side of the coin when he botched the Kornilov affair, stopping one threat at the expense of boosting the influence of another threat, the Bolsheviks, who helped to stop Kornilov (9).

(8) Here the candidate shows an awareness of interpretations.

(9) The argument here shows good balance.

The Provisional Government was also unlucky. Apart from being ineffective, another reason for its overthrow was the strength of the Bolsheviks and the decisive leadership of Lenin. This was not a foregone conclusion. When Lenin arrived back in Russia in April, his Party was still supporting the Government. Lenin made the Bolsheviks a formidable opponent through effective propaganda and imposing his leadership on colleagues who were previously divided over tactics, and using the genius of Trotsky to organise a coup.

(10) This paragraph deals well with 'other' factors, notably the contribution of the

Access to History Online AQA Change and Consolidation – Tsarist Russia, 1855–1917 – AS Question

None of these events was inevitable, but Bolshevik strengths in the end did feed off the Government's ineffectiveness (10).

By October the Provisional Government had shown itself to be so ineffective that it may well have collapsed even without the Bolsheviks. However, the Bolsheviks were there to fill the power vacuum which already existed – because they were in the right place at the right time, and with a leader who recognised the opportunities and was prepared to seize them (11).

Bolsheviks.
Knowledge is again blended well with analysis.

(11) The answer ends with a brief but effective conclusion, reinforcing analysis and judgements from earlier in the answer.

Examiner's Assessment

The answer is worth Level 5. It is well focused throughout, and the argument is coherent, balanced and backed up well with a good range of knowledge. There is evaluation and judgement at frequent intervals, and the candidate shows an awareness of interpretations. The whole answer is well structured, and does not waste knowledge, which is used instead with a good level of precision.

Mark Scheme
L1: The answer is descriptive, only loosely linked to the question, or only answering part of it, or it is an explicit answer with little or no effective support. The answer is likely to be generalised and possibly assertive rather than argued. [1–6 marks]
L2: The answer shows some understanding of the role of the Provisional Government in bringing about the result of the October/November Revolution. It may be predominantly descriptive about what happened in Russia between the 1917 Revolutions, with some links to the issue of the Government's responsibility or other factors, or the answer may have explicit links with relevant but limited support. [7–11 marks]
L3: The answer shows developed understanding of the role of the Provisional Government in the events of 1917. There will be some assessment, supported by relevant and well-selected knowledge, although there will probably be a lack of weight of detail and/or balance. There will be some understanding of interpretations. [12–16 marks]
L4: There is explicit understanding of the relationship between the Provisional Government and the outcome of the 1917 Revolutions. A balanced argument will be supported by good use of evidence and understanding of interpretations. [17–21 marks]
L5: Answers will be well focused and closely argued. The arguments about how the Provisional Government contributed to events will be supported by precisely chosen evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating a well-developed understanding of interpretations and debate. [22–24 marks]

Sample questions

(a) Explain why the Social Democratic Party, formed in 1898, wanted to overthrow the Tsarist regime.

[12 marks]

(b) How successful was the Tsarist regime in overcoming threats to its survival between 1906 and 1914?

[24 marks]

Chronology: Key Events in *Tsarist Russia, 1855–1917*

1855	Accession of Alexander II during Crimean War.
1856	Alexander called for reform of serfdom, as a prelude to other reforms.
1861	Emancipation Act, the beginning of a long and complex process of freeing the serfs.
1863	Reform of the universities. Polish revolt against Russian rule, often seen as marking a more cautious approach to reform.
1864	Judicial reforms and the creation of <i>zemstva</i> or local assemblies.
1865	Relaxation of censorship.
1870	Creation of elected local government.
1873–74	'To the People' movement, with radicals trying to win over the peasants to a form of socialism.
1874	Military reforms reducing the length of service.
1881	Assassination of Alexander II and accession of Alexander III, seen as beginning a period of strong reaction against reform.
1889	Creation of Land Captains to strengthen control over the peasantry.
1890	<i>Zemstvo</i> franchise restricted, strengthening central authority.
1894	Death of Alexander III and accession of Nicholas II.
1905	Russian Revolution. October Manifesto issued, helping the Tsar restore order.
1906	First Duma elected, fulfilling the Tsar's promise. But the Fundamental Law emphasises Tsarist power.
1907	Second and Third Dumas elected, after manipulation by the Government.
1911	Assassination of Stolypin, one of the Tsar's more able ministers.
1912	Lena Goldfields massacre.
1913	Fourth Duma elected.
1914	Outbreak of First World War.
1917	Feb (old style calendar)/March (new style calendar) First Revolution of 1917: Tsar abdicates and Provisional Government takes over. Apr May July Lenin returns to Russia to assume active command of the Bolsheviks. Several Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries join the Government. Failure of Russian offensive against Germany. Days disturbances lead to Lenin fleeing to Finland. Kerensky becomes prime minister.

Access to History Online AQA Change and Consolidation – Tsarist Russia, 1855–1917 – AS Question

- Sept Attempted takeover by General Kornilov is defeated with Bolshevik help.
Lenin calls for immediate revolution.
- Oct Kamenev and Zinoviev call for caution by the Bolsheviks. Bolsheviks win majorities in Petrograd and Moscow Soviets. Lenin returns to Petrograd and Bolsheviks seize power - the second Russian Revolution of 1917.
- Nov Elections to the long-awaited Constituent Assembly are finally held.

Teaching Resources

1. For each of the five events in the table below, note down how each of the five political groups on the left of the table would have responded.

	The Tsar's October Manifesto	Creation of the First Duma	Stolypin's agricultural reforms	The outbreak of the First World War	Creation of the Provisional Government
Kadets					
Octobrists					
SRs					
Bolsheviks					
Mensheviks					

2. For each of the two revolutions of 1917, list up to 10 causes (short- or long-term) and divide your reasons into three main headings: political, economic and social.

Then identify at least three similarities between the two revolutions, and three differences.

Websites

www.hsc.esu.edu.au/modern_history/national_studies/russia