



GCE

History A

Unit **Y249/01**: Russia 1894–1941

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **H105**

Mark Scheme for June 2016

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.



All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2016

These are the annotations, (including abbreviations), including those used in scoris, which are used when marking.

Annotation	Meaning of annotation
BP	Blank Page
	Highlight
Off-page comment	
A	Assertion
AN	Analysis
EVAL	Evaluation
EXP	Explanation
F	Factor
ILL	Illustrates/Describes
IRRL	Irrelevant, a significant amount of material that does not answer the question
J	Judgement
KU	Knowledge and understanding
SC	Simple comment
	Unclear
V	View

1. Use the following indicative content mark scheme in conjunction with the generic levels of response in the Appendix.
2. Here is the mark scheme for this question paper.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1*	<p>How effectively did Nicholas II deal with the problems that he faced from 1894 to 1914?</p> <p>In arguing that he did deal effectively with problems,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider that he introduced the Duma and legalised political parties. • Answers might consider that he dealt successfully with economic problems, with both Witte and Stolypin delivering reforms. • Answers might consider the use of the secret police against opposition. • Answers might consider the continued support for the Romanov dynasty. <p>In arguing that he was not effective,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider the rise of political opposition to him from within the Duma, and the lack of representation. • Answers might consider the level of discontent from the working class and peasantry, for example at Lena and the growing land hunger. • Answers might consider the failure to win the war against Japan. • Answers might consider the character of Nicholas and the role of his advisers. 	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No set answer is expected • At Level 5 there will be judgement as to how effectively he dealt with the problems. • At higher levels, answers might establish criteria against which to judge how effectively he dealt with them. • To be valid judgements, claims must be supported by relevant and accurate material. If not, they are assertions. • Knowledge must not be credited in isolation, it should only be credited where it is used as the basis for analysis and evaluation, in line with descriptions in the levels mark scheme.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
2*	<p>'Between 1928 and 1941, Stalin's economic policies were a disaster for the Soviet Union.' How far do you agree?</p> <p>In arguing that they were a disaster,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider the level of hunger within the countryside, perhaps in the Ukraine in the 1930s. • Answers might consider the persecution of the kulaks. • Answers might consider the level of resistance to change, especially in the countryside. • Answers might consider the lack of development of consumer goods and the relative quality of them. • Answers might consider the neglect of basic needs, such as housing and the fact that living standards were lower in 1937 than they were in 1928. • Answers might consider the lack of reliability towards official statistics. • Answers might consider the fact that, despite coercion, agricultural productivity did not return to the levels of 1913. • Answers might consider the inefficiency of methods used in the economy, such as that of slave labour or competition between regions, which led to hoarding. <p>In arguing that they were not a disaster,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider the growth of industry under the Five Year Plans, especially in coal, steel, oil and electricity. • Answers might consider the role of the Stakhanovite movement. 	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No set answer is expected • At Level 5 there will be judgement as to how far Stalin's policies were a disaster. • At higher levels, answers might establish criteria against which to judge this. • To be valid judgements, claims must be supported by relevant and accurate material. If not, they are assertions. • Knowledge must not be credited in isolation, it should only be credited where it is used as the basis for analysis and evaluation, in line with descriptions in the levels mark scheme.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Answers might consider the relationship between economic growth and the victory over Germany in the Second World War.• Answers might consider the fact that collectivisation forced the peasantry off the land, something which was required for industrialisation.• Answers might consider the fact that the massive expansion of industrial output allowed Stalin to modernise Russia, hence achieving his aims.		

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
3	<p>'The Whites were ultimately unsuccessful in winning the Civil War. This was because of political disunity: at the very least they failed to act as a focus for all the various anti Bolshevik forces.'</p> <p>Evaluate the strengths and limitations of this interpretation, making references to other interpretations that you have studied.</p> <p>The historical debate centres around the reasons why the Bolsheviks won the Civil War.</p> <p>In analysing and evaluating the strengths and limitations of the interpretation, alongside the main line of argument that it was due to the weaknesses of the Whites, answers might consider the strengths of the Reds, the role of the Greens, the importance of Trotsky and the foreign interventionists.</p> <p>In analysing and evaluating the strengths of the given interpretation, answers might use knowledge and understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • White armies fighting as separate forces, under Denikin, Kolchak and Yudenich. • A lack of a united front due to the different motivations of the three aforementioned leaders. • Geographical limitations: the Reds controlled communication and supply lines; the Whites were scattered and geographically disunited. • Lack of leadership, especially when compared to Trotsky. • Reliance on foreign aid which, in the aftermath of the First World War, gave credence to the unifying call of the Bolsheviks. 	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No set answer is expected. • Candidates must use their knowledge and understanding of the historical context and the wider historical debate surrounding the issue to analyse and evaluate the given interpretation. • Candidates must refer to at least one other interpretation. • The quality of analysis and the evaluation of the interpretation should be considered when assigning answers to a Level, not the quantity of other interpretations included in the answer. • Other interpretations considered as part of evaluation and analysis of the given interpretation do not need to be attributed to specific named historians, but they must be recognisable historical interpretations, rather than the candidate's own viewpoint. • Answers may include more on strengths or more on limitations and there is no requirement for a 50/50 split in the evaluation, however, for Level 5 there should be well-supported evaluation of both, in line with Levels descriptors. • Candidates are not required to construct their own interpretation.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>In analysing and evaluating the limitations of the given interpretation, answers might use knowledge and understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Red control of central Russia, including Moscow and St Petersburg. This was vital as it provided control of the administrative centre of the country. • Control of key industries which allowed access to munitions and supplies. • Ideological motivations for the Red Army. Those fighting for the Red Army were bound by a common cause, unlike those fighting for the Whites/Greens. • Trotsky's leadership was unifying and highly effective, especially through his control of the railways. • Attitude towards foreign powers allowed the Reds to act as defenders of Russia as opposed to the Whites. • The fact that the Reds were claiming to the peasantry that the Whites would re-seize their land was a powerful impetus for Red support from the peasants. <p>Other interpretations that might be used in evaluation of the given interpretation are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpretations which acknowledge the weaknesses of the Whites, but which take a broader view, encompassing the fuller picture of the strengths of the Bolsheviks and the interrelationship between the two. • Interpretations that focus on the role of Trotsky and his military prowess. • Interpretations that place emphasis on the land question and its development since 1917. 		

APPENDIX 1 – this contains the generic mark scheme grids

	<i>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.</i>
	Generic mark scheme for Section A, Questions 1 and 2: Essay [30]
Level 5 25–30 marks	There is a mostly consistent focus on the question. Generally accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding is demonstrated through most of the answer and is evaluated and analysed in order to reach substantiated judgements, but these are not consistently well-developed. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and in the most part substantiated.
Level 4 19–24 marks	The question is generally addressed. Generally accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and understanding is demonstrated through most of the answer with evaluation and some analysis, and this is used appropriately to support the judgements that are made. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.
Level 3 13–18 marks	The question is partially addressed. There is demonstration of some relevant knowledge and understanding, which is evaluated and analysed in parts of the answer, but in places knowledge is imparted rather than being used. The analysis is appropriately linked to the judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements may not always be made explicit. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.
Level 2 7–12 marks	The focus is more on the topic than the specific demands of the question. Knowledge and understanding is limited and not well used, with only limited evaluation and analysis, which is only sometimes linked appropriately to the judgements made. The information has some relevance, but is communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.
Level 1 1–6 marks	The answer relates to the topic but not the specific question. The answer contains only very limited relevant knowledge which is evaluated and analysed in a very limited way. Judgements are unsupported and are not linked to analysis. Relevant knowledge is limited, generalised and poorly used; attempts at argument are no more than assertion. Information presented is basic and may be ambiguous or unstructured. The information is supported by limited evidence.
0 marks	No evidence of understanding and no demonstration of any relevant knowledge.

	<i>AO3: Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.</i>
	Generic mark scheme for Section B, Question 3: Interpretation [20]
Level 5 17–20 marks	The answer has a very good analysis of the interpretation. It uses detailed and relevant knowledge of the historical context and shows thorough understanding of the wider historical debate, in the form of detailed examination of other interpretations, in order to produce a well-supported evaluation of both the strengths and weaknesses of the given interpretation.
Level 4 13–16 marks	The answer has a good analysis of the interpretation. It uses relevant knowledge of the historical context and good understanding of the wider historical debate, in the form of examination of other interpretations, in order to produce a supported evaluation of both the strengths and weaknesses of the given interpretation.
Level 3 9–12 marks	The answer has a partial analysis of the interpretation. It uses some relevant knowledge of the historical context and shows partial understanding of the wider historical debate, in the form of reference to other interpretations, in order to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the given interpretation. The evaluation may be un-even with only limited treatment of either limitations or strengths, but both will be addressed.
Level 2 5–8 marks	The answer has a limited analysis of the interpretation. It uses generalised knowledge of the historical context and shows limited understanding of the wider historical debate, in the form of generalised reference to other interpretations, in order to produce a limited evaluation of the given interpretation. The evaluation may deal with either strengths or limitations in a very superficial way, or may only address limitations or strengths.
Level 1 1–4 marks	The answer has a very limited analysis of the interpretation which may be descriptive and relate more to the topic area than the detail of the interpretation. It uses very limited and generalised knowledge of the historical context and shows very limited or no understanding of the wider historical debate, with reference to other interpretations being implicit or lacking, in order to produce a very simplistic, asserted evaluation of the given interpretation.
0 marks	No evidence of understanding or reference to the interpretation.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2016

