



General Certificate of Education January 2011

AS History 1041

HIS2E

Unit 2E

The Reign of Peter the Great of Russia,

1683–1725

Final

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which candidates meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a candidate performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

January 2011**GCE AS History Unit 2: Historical Issues: Periods of Change****HIS2E: The Reign of Peter the Great of Russia, 1682–1725****Question 1**

01 Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to bringing about industrialisation in Russia. *(12 marks)*

Target: AO2(a)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit.	0
-----------------------------------	----------

L1: Answers will **either** briefly paraphrase/describe the content of the two sources **or** identify simple comparison(s) between the sources. Skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

L2: Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources and identify some differences and/or similarities. There may be some limited own knowledge. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed. **3-6**

L3: Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences **and** similarities and using own knowledge to explain and evaluate these. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed. **7-9**

L4: Responses will make a developed comparison between the views expressed in the two sources and will apply own knowledge to evaluate and to demonstrate a good contextual understanding. Answers will, for the most part, show good skills of written communication. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the levels scheme.

Candidates will need to identify differences between the views of the two sources. For example:

- Peter sees himself as a ‘good ruler’ in Source A encouraging industry, whereas in Source B, Peter’s actions are problematic
- Peter saw the need for compulsion to overcome the lack of knowledge and tradition in industry in Russia in Source A, whereas in Source B, this interference was part of the problem in sustaining economic development

- in Source A, Peter sees enterprises as unfinished because of the lack of expertise of his people whereas in Source B inactivity is blamed on Peter becoming distracted.

Candidates will need to apply their own knowledge of context to explain these differences. They might, for example, refer to:

- instances where the state supported or provided aid (or compulsion) in the setting up of industry: for example interest, free loans, the granting of monopolies, tax exemptions, the use of forced labour, the use of foreign expertise
- examples of resistance to involvement in industry: for example, noble resentment to the use of runaway serfs in factories, the limited number of factories set up, noble resistance to education
- problems of interference: for example, alienating merchants by allowing manufacturers to sell direct, saddles left to rot because no order was given
- Peter's frustration at the slow pace of change.

To address 'how far', candidates should also indicate some similarity between the sources. For example:

- the lack of an industrial tradition in Russia
- the disinterest of the nobles in involvement in industrial enterprises.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, candidates may conclude that the lack of an industrial tradition in Russia hindered industrial development and that whilst some of Peter's policies did seek to overcome this, he did not recognise that these created other issues which also hindered Russia's industrial development.

Question 1

- 02** Use Sources A, B and C and your own knowledge.

How important were Peter the Great's policies in explaining the limited growth of Russia's economy by 1725? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(b), AO2(a), AO2(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit.

0

L1: Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may comprise an undeveloped mixture of the two. They may contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**

L2: Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may contain a mixture of the two. They may be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the focus of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**

L3: Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question using evidence from **both** the sources **and** own knowledge. They will provide some assessment backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**

L4: Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**

L5: Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how important' and 'how successful questions', the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Candidates should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

Relevant material from the sources would include:

- **Source A:** in this source, Peter argues that it is the disinterest of the people and the lack of industrial tradition in Russia which is limiting its economic development; candidates could also comment that the lack of industrial tradition is partly due to Russia's social structure which Peter strengthened, although he himself does not recognise this explicitly
- **Source B:** in this source, Russia's lack of industrial tradition is again indicated which again could be interpreted as partly due to the social structure, but Peter's own policies, lack of planning, and constant interference is also given as a hindrance to Russia's economic development
- **Source C:** this source clearly argues that Peter's strengthening of the existing social structure in Russia which meant a lack of a middle class, was important in explaining Russia's lack of economic development.

From candidates' own knowledge:

Factors suggesting that Peter's policies hindered Russia's economic development might include:

- the strengthening of the nobles' control over serfs, as a method of rewarding the nobles for loyalty meant there was a lack of 'free labour'
- this also cemented the nobility's position as landowners rather than as entrepreneurs
- very little development of agriculture
- the fear of brutal punishments led to a lack of initiative
- the almost constant war during Peter's reign meant that resources were necessarily directed to that single purpose; this also meant there was limited capital available to invest.

Factors suggesting that Peter's policies did not hinder Russia's economic development might include:

- the success that some areas of industry experienced – the iron works in the Urals; hemp cloth; copper; the way Russia was able to direct the growth of industry to meet the demands of war
- the growth of trade both internally and with other countries
- these developments could be put in the context of the change during Peter's reign and also in the context of the demands he created through war and infrastructure projects
- candidates might also refer to other problems which existed in Russia, i.e. the size of Russia, issues with communication, inefficiencies in government and administration, and

argue that these factors were more important in hindering Russia's economic development.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that whilst Peter's social policies did not always help the growth of Russian industry, there were also many long-term issues which it would be difficult to reverse during the period of Peter's reign. In addition, Peter did not always seek to strengthen the social structure which pre-existed his reign, but that his attempts to reform Russia quickly and radically, sometimes had this effect.

Question 2

03 Explain why Russia was politically unstable during the 1680s. *(12 marks)*

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit.

0

L1: Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

L2: Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**

L3: Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

L4: Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Russia was politically unstable in the 1680s.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- rivalry between courtly factions: Peter's father Alexei had died suddenly in 1676. He had two marriages – the first to a member of the Miloslavsky family, produced 8 daughters but only 2 sickly sons; the second to a member of the Naryshkin family produced Peter
- disputes over who the rightful heir should be: when Peter's elder half-brother Feodor III died in 1682, Peter was only 9 years old, but his sixteen year old half-brother Ivan was severely disabled
- the ambitions of Peter's eldest sister, Sophia who had become leader of the Miloslavsky faction at court. She feared for her position when Peter was declared Tsar with his mother acting as regent
- discontent of powerful elements of the nobility: the Streltsy felt that their privileged position was being undermined. Sophia was able to use this to spread rumours about

the Naryshkin faction prompting the Streltsy mutiny. Following this Peter and Ivan were made co-tsars with Sophia acting as regent

- the insecure nature of the Regency: by the end of the 1680s, Sophia's position as a regent grew more tenuous as Peter grew to adulthood, and the Naryshkins wanted to regain their previous position of authority
- discontent with the Regency: Sophia's foreign policy was a failure and there was unease about her western reforms and the influence of Golitsyn.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might indicate an understanding that in the absence of an adult healthy male heir after Peter's father had unexpectedly died in 1676, court factions had jostled for positions of power and authority and used longer-term feelings of discontent such as the Streltsy's resentment, or more immediate issues of concern such as failure in the conflict with the Ottoman Empire.

Question 2

- 04** ‘Peter the Great’s reforms of government succeeded in increasing the power of the tsar by 1725.’
 Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. **(24 marks)**

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit.	0
-----------------------------------	----------

- | | |
|------------|--|
| L1: | Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. 1-6 |
| L2: | Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. 7-11 |
| L3: | Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. 12-16 |
| L4: | Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. 17-21 |
| L5: | Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. 22-24 |

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence which supports the view given against that which does not.

Evidence which agree(s) might include:

- Peter strengthened centralisation of decision making through the use of the senate
- the tsar's ability to enforce his policies in practice was increased by Peter's local government reforms
- the replacement of the prikazy system with the colleges increased the efficiency of administration
- Peter did not use the Duma – the traditional assembly of the nobility in his government
- Peter was feared and respected by his contemporaries – this was increased by his use of secret police and the way he dealt with opposition; for example he removed the Streltsy which had, in his own childhood, shown its power in changing the nature of the regency
- the abolition of the patriarch and the subordination of the church into government.

Evidence which disagree(s) might include:

- the short-comings of his reforms; candidates could give examples about the senate, and/or local government reforms to support this
- problems in communication, inefficiency and corruption
- the Tsar was still dependent on the support of the nobility and their position in relation to serfs was strengthened
- the power of the tsar was still dependent on the individual, exemplified by the decline in many of Peter's reforms after his death.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that whilst the position of the tsar was potentially very powerful, Peter's reforms were not able to overcome all the problems which acted as limitations.

Question 3

05 Explain why Peter the Great went to war with the Turks in 1695. *(12 marks)*

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit.

0

L1: Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

L2: Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**

L3: Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

L4: Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Peter the Great went to war with the Turks in 1695.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- Peter was enthusiastic about war. Since childhood he had led his own regiments and he was keen to try out his war-games for real
- Peter had started to initiate some reforms of his armed forces and he wanted to see these in practice
- Peter was fascinated by the sea and wanted to build a Russian navy
- Peter wanted to gain access to a warm water port and he saw Azov as the starting point to access to the Black Sea
- Peter wanted to firm up Russia's defence against Tatar raids in the south
- Peter wanted to continue previous campaigns against the Turks, for example under Sophia and Golitsyn, and to succeed where they had failed.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship between the reasons given. For example, they might point to Peter's personality, impetuous and enthusiastic for war, highlighted by his childhood activities which he was then able to realise when he took sole control of Russia. Or candidates might prioritise their reasons. For example, it could be argued that access to a warm water port was Peter's key objective throughout his reign; war with the Turks was seen as the way to achieve this for historic and diplomatic reasons though his attention later shifted to the Baltic Sea when he entered an anti-Swedish alliance and could not gain allies for continuing war with the Ottoman empire.

Question 3

- 06** ‘Peter the Great had achieved his foreign policy aims by 1721.’
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. **(24 marks)**

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit.	0
-----------------------------------	----------

L1: Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**

L2: Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**

L3: Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**

L4: Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**

L5: Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which agree with the view that Peter had achieved his foreign policy aims by the end of his reign.

Points/factors/evidence which agree(s) might include:

- his success in the Great Northern War: the gain of a warm water port, dominance of the Baltic, Russia replacing Sweden as the dominant northern European power
- Russia's increased reputation in Europe: embassies, diplomatic links, marriages, treaties/alliances
- Russia's expansion eastwards
- the growing power of both Russia's army and navy.

Points/factors/evidence which disagree(s) might include:

- the overall failure of Peter's attempts to establish a port on the Black Sea
- the limited nature of the marriage links/alliances with other European states
- failures to establish links in the east, for example with China.

Good answers are likely to conclude that although Peter did not succeed in achieving all his foreign policy aims, most notably his failures with the Ottoman Empire, the majority of his aims, and probably the most important were achieved. The success in the Great Northern War established Russia as a great military power; this in turn enhanced its diplomatic status and ensured Russia began to be perceived as a great European power.