



Pearson

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2017

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level
In History (WHI01)

Paper 1: Depth Study with Interpretations

Option 1B: Russia in Revolution, 1881-1917

Edexcel, BTEC and LCCI qualifications

Edexcel, BTEC and LCCI qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body offering academic and vocational qualifications that are globally recognised and benchmarked. For further information, please visit our qualification websites at www.edexcel.com, www.btec.co.uk or www.lcci.org.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus

About Pearson

Pearson is the world's leading learning company, with 40,000 employees in more than 70 countries working to help people of all ages to make measurable progress in their lives through learning. We put the learner at the centre of everything we do, because wherever learning flourishes, so do people. Find out more about how we can help you and your learners at: www.pearson.com/uk

January 2017

Publication Code WHI01_1B_1701_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

General marking guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the last candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the first.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed-out work should be marked **unless** the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

How to award marks

Finding the right level

The first stage is to decide which level the answer should be placed in. To do this, use a 'best-fit' approach, deciding which level most closely describes the quality of the answer. Answers can display characteristics from more than one level, and where this happens markers must use their professional judgement to decide which level is most appropriate.

Placing a mark within a level

After a level has been decided on, the next stage is to decide on the mark within the level. The instructions below tell you how to reward responses within a level. However, where a level has specific guidance about how to place an answer within a level, always follow that guidance.

Markers should be prepared to use the full range of marks available in a level and not restrict marks to the middle. Markers should start at the middle of the level (or the upper-middle mark if there is an even number of marks) and then move the mark up or down to find the best mark. To do this, they should take into account how far the answer meets the requirements of the level:

- If it meets the requirements *fully*, markers should be prepared to award full marks within the level. The top mark in the level is used for answers that are as good as can realistically be expected within that level
- If it only *barely* meets the requirements of the level, markers should consider awarding marks at the bottom of the level. The bottom mark in the level is used for answers that are the weakest that can be expected within that level
- The middle marks of the level are used for answers that have a *reasonable* match to the descriptor. This might represent a balance between some characteristics of the level that are fully met and others that are only barely met.

Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 1

Targets: AO1 (10 marks): 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.

AO3 (15 marks): Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, difference ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple or generalised statements are made about the view presented in the question. • Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the issue in the question. • Judgement on the view is assertive, with little supporting evidence.
2	7-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some understanding of the issue raised by the question is shown and analysis is attempted by describing some points that are relevant. • Mostly accurate knowledge is included, but it lacks range or depth and only has implicit links to issues relevant to the question. • A judgement on the view is given, but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.
3	13-18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding and some analysis of the issue raised by the question is shown by selecting and explaining some key points of view that are relevant. • Knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the issues raised by the question, but material lacks range or depth • Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement on the view and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.
4	19-25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key issues relevant to the question are explored by analysing and explaining the issues of interpretation raised by the claim. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the issues raised by the question and to meet most of its demands. • Valid criteria by which the view can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may only be partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.

Question	Indicative content
1	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether the Social Democrats were the main threat to Tsarism in the years 1898-1903.</p> <p>The evidence supporting the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Social Democrats were the main threat because their aim was to mobilise the growing industrial working class in support of revolution • The support for the Social Democrats was in cities close to government and therefore a greater threat than other opposition groups • Lenin's return from exile resulted in the Social Democrats becoming a disciplined conspiratorial group • The Social Democrats split into Bolsheviks and Mensheviks made the threat of revolution greater. <p>The evidence countering or modifying the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Social Revolutionary Party, founded in 1901, was more of a threat as it had its own combat group and was prepared to use terrorist methods • The Social Revolutionary Party attracted the peasants who were the largest social group in Russia and therefore posed a greater threat • The Social Democrats' split weakened their ability to threaten Tsarism • The Union of Liberation Party brought together moderate groups that posed a threat because they wanted a liberal constitution. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether the political reforms of Tsar Nicholas II were ineffective in the years 1906-14.</p> <p>The evidence supporting the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The October Manifesto was rejected by some (e.g. Trotsky) as empty words, and was an ineffective political reform as it did not address the issues that had led to 1905 • The voting system for the new Duma was complex, and so was ineffective in giving representation to the classes and an effective say in government • Political reform did not remove opposition, e.g. widespread strikes that led to a General Strike that included workers, students and the professional classes, and peasant revolts • The Tsar changed the Fundamental Laws when it suited and this had a direct impact on the make-up and power of the Duma. <p>The evidence countering or modifying the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The introduction of the October Manifesto gave the Tsar an opportunity to build a consensus in support of gradual political change • Fundamental freedoms were granted, e.g. speech, assembly and association • The Duma, was established allowing participation in the political process to those who had previously not been involved • The rule of law was established meaning that no law could come into effect without the approval of the Duma. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether protest in towns was the main reason why there was a revolution in Russia in February 1917.</p> <p>The evidence supporting the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spontaneous protests in major cities created a climate of challenge to the regime and this fuelled the revolution • In February 1917 demonstrations broke out in Petrograd with women protesting about food shortages and this was followed by a general strike that led to revolution • Troops sent to stop the disturbances (an inferior garrison of 160,000 troops) mutinied and joined the protestors creating a sense that Tsarist rule was over and revolution was taking place • Soviets sprang up in many towns and organised protests urging people to join the revolution and overthrow the Tsar. <p>The evidence countering or modifying the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The poor performance in the war and its association with the Tsar, e.g. defeats in 1914, 1915 and 1916 accounted for 7 million dead and injured and these were blamed on the Tsar • The role of the Empress from 1915 damaged the government and people lost faith and wanted change • The Duma, recalled in November 1916, denounced the inefficiency and corruption of the government and this encouraged others to demand change • The Tsar's rejection of the Duma's concern about protest and the possible action that should be taken led to the Duma effectively assuming power and establishing a liberal government under Prince Lvov. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether the signing of the Armistice in December 1917 was the main reason why the Bolsheviks were able to hold on to power in 1917.</p> <p>The evidence supporting the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The war was deeply unpopular and peace increased the popularity of the Bolsheviks and their ability to hold onto power • If peace had not been agreed the German army would have arrived in Petrograd and removed the Bolsheviks • The Russian army was disintegrating as peasants soldiers returned home to secure their share of land distribution and this made the Bolsheviks popular across the countryside. <p>The evidence countering or modifying the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Bolsheviks used force to hold on to power, e.g. in Moscow fighting broke out and after more than a thousand people had died the city was taken by the Bolsheviks • The Bolsheviks secured the support of the peasantry, e.g. the abolition of land ownership without compensation, and land distribution proved popular • The role of Trotsky in organising a Bolshevik military force • The Bolsheviks used terror to hold onto power, e.g. in December 1917 the Bolsheviks set up the Cheka, the All Russian Extraordinary Commission for Combating Counter-Revolution and Sabotage • The Bolsheviks allowed elections to the Constituent Assembly to go ahead, and this indicated a commitment to democracy, which proved popular. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>