
A-level **HISTORY**

Paper 1E Russia in the Age of Absolutism and Enlightenment, 1682–1796

Mark scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer 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 associates 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 associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate 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, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

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 from aqa.org.uk

A-level History Paper 1 Specimen Mark Scheme

1E Russia in the Age of Absolutism and Enlightenment, 1682–1796

Section A

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|
| 0 | 1 | Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to opposition to Peter the Great. | [30 marks] |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|

Target: AO3

Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Generic Mark Scheme

- | | | |
|------------|--|--------------|
| L5: | Shows a very good understanding of the interpretations put forward in all three extracts and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. Evaluation of the arguments will be well-supported and convincing. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. | 25-30 |
| L4: | Shows a good understanding of the interpretations given in all three extracts and combines this with knowledge of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. The evaluation of the arguments will be mostly well-supported, and convincing, but may have minor limitations of depth and breadth. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. | 19-24 |
| L3: | Provides some supported comment on the interpretations given in all three extracts and comments on the strength of these arguments in relation to their historic context. There is some analysis and evaluation but there may be an imbalance in the degree and depth of comments offered on the strength of the arguments. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. | 13-18 |
| L2: | Provides some accurate comment on the interpretations given in at least two of the extracts, with reference to the historical context. The answer may contain some analysis, but there is little, if any, evaluation. Some of the comments on the strength of the arguments may contain some generalisation, inaccuracy or irrelevance. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. | 7-12 |
| L1: | Either shows an accurate understanding of the interpretation given in one extract only or addresses two/three extracts, but in a generalist way, showing limited accurate understanding of the arguments they contain, although there may be some general awareness of the historical context. Any comments on the strength of the arguments are likely to be generalist and contain some inaccuracy and/or irrelevance. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. | 1-6 |

Nothing worthy of credit.

0

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.

Note: in responding to this question, students may choose to analyse and evaluate each extract in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach of individual arguments. Either approach could be equally valid, and what follows is indicative of the analysis and evaluation which may be relevant.

Extract A

In their analysis of Anderson's argument students could identify the following:

- in some ways the opposition to Peter stemmed from a long-standing, historical and cultural antipathy to change and particularly foreign-influenced change
- however, this was exacerbated by both the scale and nature of Peter's reforms. It was not only their Western nature but the burden placed on the Russian people and their suffering which led to discontent throughout his reign
- opposition to Peter was apparent in both a number of revolts and in low-scale disquiet about Peter and his policies; resistance that lessened their effectiveness.

In their evaluation of his argument, students could refer to the following:

- evidence to corroborate or not the existence of xenophobia in Russia, e.g. religious beliefs; the German quarter
- evidence to corroborate or not that opposition to Peter stemmed from this, e.g. the Streltsy revolt; resistance to cultural change
- evidence to corroborate or not burdens placed on the Russian people, e.g. conscription; building of St Petersburg and other infrastructure; taxation; service to the state; educational demands
- evidence to corroborate or not links between these burdens and opposition, e.g. flight of the peasants; Don Cossacks; Astrakhan
- evidence to corroborate or not the problem of non-compliance.

Extract B

In their analysis of Cracraft's argument, students could identify the following:

- that he sees the Tsarevich Alexis' conspiracy as dramatic and potentially serious
- that its seriousness was measured by the range of support it enjoyed: from officials, the Church as well as the peasantry
- it was also its aims that made it serious. Its supporters wanted to reverse Peter's reforms: to burn St Petersburg, destroy the navy, and remove the influence of foreigners in Russia
- at the same time not many people were charged so its biggest threat may have been that Alexis acted as a focus for those unhappy with Peter's reforms
- it was the threat to longstanding Russian customs which offended those affected. This ties in with the aims of the conspirators in the Alexis affair: they wanted to return to 'ancient customs and live after the old ways'

- an acknowledgement that these cultural changes were sometimes the excuse for opposition as well as the cause.

In their evaluation of his argument, students could refer to the following:

- evidence to corroborate or not Peter's fears that Alexis might undo his reforms
- evidence to corroborate or not the debate about the seriousness or even existence of a 'conspiracy'
- evidence to corroborate or not resistance to cultural change, e.g. dislike of St Petersburg; dislike of western innovations such as the navy; the return to traditional customs away from St Petersburg (dress, beards etc)
- evidence to corroborate or not cultural grievances expressed during other revolts, e.g. Streltsy; Astrakhan; Don Cossacks.

Extract C

In their analysis of Hughes's argument students could identify the following:

- support for Alexis was not just about resistance to Westernisation but also about the burdens placed on the Russian people
- there was support for Westernisation amongst some
- some of Peter's nobles even wanted to extend Western reforms to the political sphere
- but this kind of support for Alexis was in the period before his flight to Vienna and before the 'conspiracy' was uncovered.

In their evaluation of his argument, students could refer to the following:

- evidence to corroborate or not that (although Peter had shown interest in the workings of the English parliament during the Great Embassy) he had not extended political rights and had strengthened his own absolutism
- evidence to corroborate or not the burdens that Peter imposed on the Russian people, e.g. conscription; building of St Petersburg and other infrastructure; taxation; service to the state; educational demands
- evidence to corroborate or not the emergence of a more Westernised elite who accepted cultural changes such as dress and the end of the terem.

In summary, students may conclude that all three interpretations show that Peter faced constant opposition and that cultural issues always played some part in explaining this. They might also comment that although Peter put down all revolts and conspiracies that occurred during his reign, he was limited in his ability to enforce his policies so non-compliance was the biggest threat his reform faced.

Section B

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|
| 0 | 2 | To what extent, in the years 1725 to 1762, were the nobility able to re-assert the independence they had lost under Peter the Great? | [25 marks] |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|

Target: 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.

Generic Mark Scheme

- | | | |
|------------|---|--------------|
| L5: | Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. | 21-25 |
| L4: | Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. | 16-20 |
| L3: | Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. | 11-15 |
| L2: | The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. | 6-10 |
| L1: | The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. | 1-5 |
| | Nothing worthy of credit. | 0 |

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.

Evidence that might support the view that the nobility were able to re-assert their independence between 1725 and 1762:

- the repeal of Peter the Great's unpopular law of inheritance in 1730
- the raising of the qualifying age and the introduction of exemptions for some nobles from state service in the 1730s
- the shift back to Moscow under Peter II which pleased the traditionalists
- the various coups indicating weaknesses of the Tsars: Peter III; Ivan VI
- Peter III's Manifesto and the end of compulsory state service in 1762.

Evidence that might challenge this view:

- the movement back to St Petersburg after 4 years
- the failure of the attempt in 1730 to restrict Tsarina Anna's powers
- the development of autocracy under Anna and Elizabeth.

Good answers might conclude that it might be argued that none of the Tsars after Peter enjoyed the same personal authority as he did and they felt compelled to lift some of Peter's restrictions on the nobility in order to cement their own position at a time of political instability.

0 3 'Catherine the Great was an Enlightened Despot.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: 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.

Generic Mark Scheme

- | | | |
|------------|---|--------------|
| L5: | Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. | 21-25 |
| L4: | Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. | 16-20 |
| L3: | Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. | 11-15 |
| L2: | The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. | 6-10 |
| L1: | The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. | 1-5 |
| | Nothing worthy of credit. | 0 |

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.

Evidence that might support the view that Catherine II was an Enlightened Despot:

- Catherine's patronage and correspondence on Voltaire and Diderot and their attitude to her rule
- the influence of physiocratic ideas on her economic and financial policies
- Catherine's Nakaz of 1767
- Catherine's reforms of education
- her Toleration of All Faiths Edict 1773.

Evidence that might challenge this view:

- rewarding the nobility by strengthening serfdom
- the failure of the Grand Commission to lead to practical change
- reversal of religious toleration, i.e. for Jews
- the putting down of the Pugachev Revolt
- re-establishment of the secret police
- fears of the French Revolution leading to repression in the latter years of her reign.

Good answers might discuss the difficulties inherent in defining Enlightened Absolutism and demonstrate that although Catherine was interested in the ideas of the Enlightenment in theory she did not want to do anything which might threaten her position and argued that the backward nature of Russia limited her options. They may or may not conclude that this is Enlightened Absolutism in practice.

0 4 'It was Catherine the Great who fulfilled Peter the Great's foreign policy ambitions for Russia.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: 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.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

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.

Evidence that supports the view that it was Catherine that fulfilled Peter's foreign policy ambitions:

- the first Russo-Turkish war: the taking of the Ukraine and gaining access to the Black Sea
- the annexation of the Crimea and the defeat of the Turks in the 2nd Russo-Turkish War
- international reputation – the League of Armed Neutrality; mediation in the Bavarian succession.

Evidence that might challenge this view:

- that Peter's breakthrough in the Baltic was the most important of his ambitions and it was he who achieved this
- equally that it was Peter who brought Russia into Europe
- Catherine's lack of progress in the East
- failure to defeat Sweden in the Russo-Sweden War 1788–1790
- limits to the League of Armed Neutrality
- still a lesser international role than both Peter and Catherine desired.

Good answers might conclude that Catherine enjoyed great success, particularly in extending the Russian empire south which Peter was never able to do, but she built on the foundations laid in his reign.

