



## **General Certificate of Education**

# **AS History**

## **Unit 2: HIS2E**

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

# **Specimen Mark Scheme**

The specimen assessment materials are provided to give centres a reasonable idea of the general shape and character of the planned question papers and mark schemes in advance of the first operational exams.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2007 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

---

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

- (a) Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how far the views in **Source A** differ from those in **Source B** in relation to the reasons for westernisation. (12 marks)

*Target: AO2(a)*

- 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. **0-2**
- 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**

Whilst Source A suggests that Peter's drive for westernisation sprung first from the Great Embassy, Source B suggests that war dictated both the pace and style of reform. More detailed responses may comment that whilst Source B credits war with affecting the speed of reform, it does not mention what the original impetus for such change was. Moreover, Source B suggests that there was no overall design to Peter's reforms, and that they were guided by necessity and in response to external factors. This is reinforced in Source A's comment about defeat in war speeding up the pace of change, but this source does clearly imply that the desire for westernisation, the introduction of western customs, and the design of a new capital had nothing to do with military adventure. Source B makes no mention of other factors leading to westernisation, and in fact suggests that initial reforms were done quickly in response to outside pressures, whereas Source A asserts that reform was slow only to be speeded up in the first years of the 1700s.

(b) Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

How successful was Peter the Great's policy of westernisation by 1725? (24 marks)

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

- 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. **0-6**
- 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

All three sources provide ample material to support an analytical response to this question. Source A suggests that westernisation was piecemeal and that the reforms therefore proved uneven and superficial. In addition, the reforms were introduced at an increased pace in reaction to defeat in war and consequently lacked the effectiveness provided by clear planning. This conclusion is supported by Source B's reference to the rapidity of the reforms and to Peter's poor research, although there is the suggestion that later reforms were much better prepared. Whilst the tone of Source B suggests that Peter's ideas were little more than immediate responses to the crisis of the hour, and that they lacked any translation for the specific demands of Russian society, there is the clear conclusion that Peter was the founder of the modern Russian state – although there is no attribution of this achievement to westernisation. Source C questions the penetration of new ideas within Russian society and

can clearly be used as evidence to suggest that in both cultural and social changes, Russia's programme of westernisation not only had only a superficial effect but may have damaged the well-being of the Russian state.

Own knowledge can be used to either support or refute the statement in the question. Most clearly Peter did introduce successful reforms to central government based largely on the Swedish model, and his successful reforms of industry, finance, the economy, education, communications and agriculture might reasonably be said to have sprung in part from a desire to rival the West. Indeed, many of these programmes were directly based on western models; education for example perhaps lacked the effectiveness of the Austrian model, but did nevertheless have a beneficial impact on Russian society. Western ideas, technology and personnel were vital in industry, the army, navy and also education. Whilst Peter failed to convince all nobles of the wisdom of the changes, he did nevertheless succeed in constructing a new, westernised capital and its role should not be underestimated as a symbol of the new direction of Russia, in addition to being an outlet to the Baltic and as the 'Window on the West'. The new western calendar, coinage based on the Royal Mint, the introduction of western theatre, encouragement of women in society all succeeded to some degree. By the end of his reign, Russia was accepted into the European diplomatic circles and the European impression of Russian society had certainly changed. However, Peter's westernisation was limited most obviously by inertia and the lack of trust of foreigners. Changes even to dress caused opposition and St Petersburg was hardly welcomed enthusiastically. A lack of money and skills further limited the depth to which the western reforms went in Russian society – ultimately westernisation as a force for social change might be seen as an urban phenomenon affecting only a minority of the Russian population. However, its effect as a model and inspiration for the major domestic reforms of Peter's reign can not be dismissed.

## Question 2

- (a) Explain why Peter launched two attacks to gain Azov in 1695 and 1696. (12 marks)

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

- 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. **0-2**
- 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**

Reference might be made to the long-standing objectives of Russian policy in the south and especially the desire for access to the Black Sea. The Tartar raids, combined with Peter's impetuous nature, also account for the campaigns. The First Azov Campaign was launched in March 1695, with a Russian army consisting of a large number of unreliable Streltsy who disobeyed their foreign officers. The command structure was chaotic with Peter himself refusing to take charge. The greatest failing was possibly the lack of an effective navy and transport barges. Peter's only notable command decision was to launch a full frontal attack on Azov which inevitably failed. The second campaign in 1696 benefited from better planning. The building of over 20 galleys and the effective provision for a larger Russian force consisting of trained cavalry gave Peter the first victory of his reign. However, Azov did not represent a great strategic gain as the Turkish fort at Kerch blocked access to the Black Sea. Peter's attempt whilst on the Great Embassy to win allies for a further attack on the Turks failed and the outbreak of the Northern War forced Peter to negotiate with the Turks. The Treaty of Karlowitz of 1699 ceded Azov to Russia but crucially allowed the Turks to keep hold of Kerch and thus prevented Russian access to the Black Sea.

- (b) 'Peter the Great's leadership was the most important reason for the success of his foreign policy.'  
 Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

- 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. **0-6**
- 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

Whilst initial failure in foreign policy might be ascribed to Peter's impetuous nature and lack of planning, he subsequently embarked on an extensive programme of military reform. Improvements in equipment such as the ring bayonet, the development of better tactics and the use of foreign advisers, combined with the establishment of a navy, enabled Peter to turn around his military fortunes. Peter's military tactics, such as the scorched earth policy used in 1708, ensured that a number of successes on the battlefield itself can be ascribed to Peter's personal leadership. However, there are other factors that affected the successful foreign policy. Despite being a disastrous encounter, Peter was fortunate not to have suffered a worse fate during the Battle of Narva, for Charles failed to exploit the open road to Moscow. In addition, the pre-occupation of the French with the Spanish succession resulted in the withdrawal of French support for Sweden. That Sweden subsequently turned her attention to Poland was the fortune that gave Peter the opportunity to embark on his vital military reforms. Indeed, it was good luck that again ensured that after his disastrous incursion into Turkey, the Peace of Pruth was astonishingly lenient. Whilst Peter was certainly a major factor in the success of foreign policy, good fortune, competent military leaders and the weakness of enemies certainly played a very important role.

### Question 3

- (a) Explain why Peter the Great promoted Russian industrial development. (12 marks)

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

- 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. **0-2**
- 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

Peter's interest in industry largely focused on the demands of the military and, most obviously, iron, textile and leather. Whilst serf labour dominated these industries, Peter increasingly used foreign workers, particularly in the arms industries. After the Great Embassy, Peter became adept at ordering small quantities of foreign armaments and then setting his own workers the task of duplication. By 1711 Russia had become self-sufficient in the production of personal firearms, largely as a result of the demands of the much enlarged army and also the need to replace the weaponry lost at Narva. The need for iron to provide for armaments led directly to the founding of several new iron works in the Urals between 1701 and 1704. Overall over 50 new iron foundries were established during Peter's reign, almost all of which provided iron for armaments. The iron industry was so successful that by 1716 Russia was exporting iron and by 1725 Russia had over 16,000 cannons in reserve. Peter's determination to promote industry is reflected by his decree that any noble who concealed mineral resources on his lands was subject to criminal proceedings, and also by the ukaz of 1721 that allowed factory owners to buy up entire villages and use the serfs for labour. Peter also encouraged the textile industry to provide uniforms for his new military and sails for his navy after 1696. Peter tried to encourage a spirit of enterprise amongst his subjects and clearly wanted Russia to become self-sufficient. In 1719 state monopolies in industry were abolished and this, combined with the opening of the College of Mining and Manufacturing, did successfully promote some change. By the end of Peter's reign over 230 new factories had been established in Russia including silk, velvet, linen and brickworks, although his most successful and enduring proved to be the ironworks.

- (b) 'The size of Russia was the most important factor limiting the success of Peter the Great's economic reforms.'  
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

- 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. **0-6**
- 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**

The size of Russia presented serious problems. Despite Peter's efforts to improve communications – largely through the construction of a canal system – the transport of raw materials and of finished goods was slow and exceptionally costly. This made the difficulty of enforcing central control even more acute which in turn encouraged nepotism and corruption in the provinces. The sheer diversity of peoples and customs throughout Russia made this regionalism even more acute. Factors such as the innate conservatism of the Russian people were no doubt made worse by the inability to communicate effectively with all. However, there were other factors that were perhaps more significant. Most obviously, Peter suffered from a lack of an entrepreneurial class, and his very efforts to provide some sort of state direction may well have undermined the very independence that he was seeking to instil. A business class was anyway not likely to emerge, given the absence of a strong domestic market and the lack of capital. Peter's attempt to improve the economy was therefore funded in some measure by the state itself; certainly many of the contracts evolved from Peter's military requirements. There was unfortunately little evidence of independent commerce/manufacture that did not rely in some way on the state. The poor skills of the Russian people forced Peter to rely, at least initially, on foreign artisans and merchants. The use of state monopolies may have protected many fledgling industries but also prevented innovation; indeed, given the high level of taxation and the punishments for failure to fulfil government contracts, entrepreneurs had little incentive for improvement or to take risks.