



**General Certificate of Education
June 2013**

AS History 1041

HIS2E

Unit 2E

**The Reign of Peter the Great of Russia,
1682–1725**

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 events which all examiners participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each examiner analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised 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 students' 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 © 2013 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Copyright

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges 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 schools/colleges 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 students. 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 students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how students have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Students who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Students 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. Students 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 students 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 student 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 students 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 students' 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*. Students should never be doubly penalised. If a student 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 student 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

June 2013

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 the reasons why Peter the Great went to war with Sweden in 1700. (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 students 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.

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

- Source B implies that Peter the Great was a driving force behind the anti-Swedish alliance ('Peter drew up an alliance with...') whereas Source A says that it was not a Russian creation
- Source B argues that Peter turned to the war against Sweden because he saw Sweden as more vulnerable than Turkey whereas Source A says that at this point Peter did not realise he would have to transfer his hopes from the Black Sea to the Baltic

-
- Source B concentrates on the long term grudges of the Russians: regaining lost lands, whereas Source A also includes short-term grudges: the insult at Riga which Peter used to justify declaring war on Sweden.

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

- the stalemate after the 2nd Azov campaign, the Treaty of Carlowitz, the failure to gain allies against the Turks on the Great Embassy
- the insult at Riga and the successful meeting with Augustus on the Great Embassy
- the accession of the boy king Charles XII in Sweden and Sweden's internal problems.

To address 'how far', students should also indicate some similarity between the sources. For example, the importance of gaining a Baltic coastline for Russia and particularly for Peter or Peter's opportunism in declaring war on Sweden in 1700.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, students may comment on Peter's opportunism: in Source B taking advantage of the perceived weakness of Sweden; in Source A using the pretext of the Riga insult but in both sources in order to advance long-term Russian goals.

Question 1**02** Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.How successful was Peter the Great in making Russia a great European power by 1721?
(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 students 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.

Students 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.

Students should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

Relevant material from the sources would include:

Source A

- Peter's hope to gain access to the Baltic which was denied by Sweden
- the fact that Peter was a minor partner in the original anti-Swedish alliance
- the limits to the Turkish campaign.

Source B

- Peter's hopes to return to the south later in his reign
- the desire for a Baltic coastline
- Peter's aim to usurp Sweden.

Source C

- the gain of access to the Baltic coastline
- gain in Russia's international prestige
- poor return for 20 years of war
- the terms of the Treaty of Nystadt.

From students' own knowledge:

Factors suggesting that Peter was successful in making Russia a great European power by 1721 might include:

- gaining the 'window on the west'
- Russia replacing Sweden as the north European power: the battle of Poltava; Cape Hango
- the extension of diplomatic links: marriages, embassies
- interest (both positive and negative) from Great Britain and France
- the change in the balance of power.

Factors suggesting that his foreign objectives were not met:

- the limits to Peter's success in the south
- the limits of diplomatic links: minor states; still behind Britain and France.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that Peter achieved his most important foreign policy object – access to the Baltic Sea and that this did mean that Russia had become a European power by 1721. Despite failing to break through in the south, success in the Great Northern War meant that Russia became the pre-eminent northern European power and this, in turn, advanced a nascent diplomatic status. Student might also pick up on the argument in Source C and comment on the great cost of this achievement. Whilst recognising that Russia was much more of a European power by 1721, students might also comment that Russia was probably still not as 'great' a European power as other states such as Great Britain and France.

Question 2

03 Explain why Peter was declared joint ruler with Ivan in 1682. (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 students 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 was declared joint Tsar in 1682.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- to satisfy the 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. Co-Tsars – one from both the Miloslavsky family and one from the Naryshkin's satisfied each, at least temporarily
- 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; neither was an ideal heir
- 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 sole Tsar with his mother acting as regent and therefore supported Peter and Ivan being joint rulers

- 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 which prevented Peter from being sole Tsar
- the Patriarch used his influence to resolve the dispute over the inheritance.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might indicate an understanding that the absence of an adult healthy male heir was exacerbated by court factions who jostled for positions of power and authority and used longer-term feelings of discontent such as the Streltsy's resentment. This meant that Peter and Ivan were declared joint Tsar to satisfy both the Naryshkin and Miloslavsky factions.

Question 2

- 04** 'There were no limits to Peter the Great's power within Russia after the end of the Regency in 1689.'
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 students 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.

Students 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's ability to embark on massive reform and the changes it brought about
- the subordination of the Russian Orthodox Church to the State
- the way opposition was crushed: the Streltsy revolt; Astrakhan; Cossacks; Alexis
- the limits of nobles resistance: the abandonment of the Duma; the Table of Ranks; inheritance law
- the inability of the peasants to resist: the strengthening of serfdom.

Evidence which disagree(s) might include:

- Peter was unable to overcome longstanding barriers to reform: inertia; corruption; the size of Russia
- passive resistance both from the nobles and serfs
- the cost of noble support was, in part, the strengthening of the bonds of serfdom which limited the development of Russian industry and commerce.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that although Peter the Great's position and power increased over his reign, there were some limits which held back the Petrine revolution.

Question 3

05 Explain why Peter made St. Petersburg his capital. (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 students 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 St. Petersburg became the capital city of Russia during Peter the Great's reign.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- Peter's dislike for Moscow: its conservatism; his childhood experiences
- the geographical position of St. Petersburg: its strategic significance on the Baltic Sea; Peter's 'window on the west'; its importance for trade and commerce
- the move of governmental institutions to St. Petersburg: the establishment of the Senate; the Colleges
- the ordering of the Tsarist court to St. Petersburg
- St. Petersburg becoming the cultural centre of Russia: architecture; libraries; art; fashion.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given or prioritise them. For example students might link some or all of these reasons to show

St. Petersburg was an important symbol of Peter's scheme of modernisation and westernisation. Similarly, they might argue that St. Petersburg's strategic position was of greatest importance particularly in the context of the Great Northern War.

Question 3

- 06** 'Peter the Great's enthusiasm for Westernisation began with the Great Embassy.'
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 students 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.

Students should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which agree with the view that Peter's enthusiasm for Westernisation stemmed from his Great Embassy.

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

- the development of the Russian navy based on Peter's experiences working in Dutch/English shipyards on the Great Embassy
- the construction of St. Petersburg and its western architectural style based on what he had seen abroad
- Peter forcibly shaving nobles' beards on his return to Russia; his encouragement of Western fashion and court life based on what he had seen in the West
- Peter's recruitment of foreign experts during the Great Embassy and the introduction of western commercial and industrial methods on his return.

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

- Peter's exile which meant that he grew up in the German quarter
- the demands of war seen in the Azov Campaigns and/or at Narva, which emphasised the necessity of modernisation
- the influence of Peter's early tutors and friends, i.e. Paul Menzies, Patrick Gordon
- Peter's childhood experiences that made him suspicious of traditional Muscovite ways, i.e. the Streltsy revolt
- Peter's discovery of a wrecked ship as a child encouraged him to build a navy.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that Peter's interest in the West started before the Great Embassy and was one of the reasons for undertaking the expedition. What he saw on the Great Embassy strengthened this and directed enthusiasm rather than being the source of it.