

A-LEVEL

# History

Paper 1E Russia in the Age of Absolutism and Enlightenment, 1682–1796  
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

---

---

Version: 1.0

---

---

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](http://aqa.org.uk)

## A-level History Paper 1 Specimen Mark Scheme

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

#### Section A

- |          |          |   |                   |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|
| <b>0</b> | <b>1</b> | Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to why Catherine the Great did not reform the social structure of Russia. | <b>[30 marks]</b> |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|

*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

- |            |  |              |
|------------|--|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | 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.   | <b>25-30</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | 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.   | <b>19-24</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | 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.   | <b>13-18</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | 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.   | <b>7-12</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | <b>Either</b> shows an accurate understanding of the interpretation given in one extract only <b>or</b> 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. | <b>1-6</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.  | <b>0</b>     |

**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 respond to each extract in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach to 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 identification of Massie’s argument, students may refer to the following:**

- whilst Catherine personally wanted to change the structure of Russian society, she also realised at the beginning of her reign that she was constrained by it
- Catherine’s own beliefs about serfdom
- her contradictory actions
- the limits to Catherine’s power i.e. her dependence on the nobility, army, church
- the nature of Russia that made reform of serfdom difficult – its size and governance structure.

**In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:**

- evidence to corroborate or refute Catherine’s enlightenment ideas: i.e. her dialogue with leading Philosophes; her attempts at reform; the limits to those reforms
- evidence to corroborate or refute how the nature of Russia made reform to serfdom difficult: its governance; social structure; economic system.

**Extract B: In their identification of Alexander’s argument, students may refer to the following:**

- the limited progress Catherine made in changing Russian society was the result of her own naivety and simplistic understanding of Russian society
- the aims of Catherine’s legislative commission
- the difficulties she encountered – opposition, slowness
- the problems of translating enlightened ideas in theory into practice
- the nature of Russia that made this difficult.

**In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:**

- evidence to corroborate or refute Catherine’s beliefs and attitudes to reform: the Nakaz; correspondence with Philosophes that might indicate a willingness to reform; limits to reform
- evidence about the image she wished to cultivate in Russia and abroad
- evidence to corroborate or refute how the nature of Russia made reform to serfdom difficult: its governance; social structure; economic system.

**Extract C: In their identification of Troyat’s argument, students may refer to the following:**

- Catherine feared the consequences of changing Russian society
- Catherine’s fear of what might happen if serfdom was ended after Pugachev’s revolt
- the limits to Catherine’s power i.e. her dependence on the nobility
- Catherine’s fundamental belief in the existing social structure and her lack of care for the serfs
- Catherine’s belief that the Russians were not ready for radical change.

**In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:**

- evidence to corroborate or refute Catherine’s willingness to consider social reform and whether this changed during her reign particularly in the aftermath of revolt or revolution
- the nature of absolute monarchy: i.e. that the primary duty of the tsar was to enforce its authority
- evidence to corroborate or refute how the nature of Russia made reform to serfdom difficult: its governance; social structure; economic system.

**Section B**

<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	To what extent had Peter the Great succeeded in creating a 'Service State' by 1725?	<b>[25 marks]</b>
----------	----------	---	-------------------

*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**

<b>L5:</b>	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.	<b>21-25</b>
<b>L4:</b>	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.	<b>16-20</b>
<b>L3:</b>	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.	<b>11-15</b>
<b>L2:</b>	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.	<b>6-10</b>
<b>L1:</b>	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.	<b>1-5</b>
	Nothing worthy of credit.	<b>0</b>

---

**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.**

**Arguments that support the proposition that Peter the Great had created a ‘Service State’ by 1725 might include:**

- creation of the Table of Ranks, a meritocracy with 3 spheres of service – army/navy/bureaucracy that exemplified the Service State
- the nobility: compulsory education; Single Inheritance Act; local government & bureaucracy
- the Church: the limits to its contemplative role; the extension of its social functions its subordination to the State & its role in suppressing discord
- strengthened bonds of serfdom: passports; the demise of different classes of serf
- conscription: army/navy: state projects - canals, St. Petersburg; industry
- economics: compulsory industrial projects and state monopolies.

**Arguments challenging the proposition that Peter the Great had created a ‘Service State’ by 1725 might include:**

- the ability of the nobility to ignore the demands for service
- the limits to the Table of Ranks
- flight of the peasants
- the difficulties of enforcing ukaz across the size of Russia.

Good answers might conclude that it could be argued that whilst the architecture of Peter’s Service State had been created by his death in 1725, the difficulties Peter faced in ensuring adherence to his policies, meant that the Service State was not fully complete by 1725.

**0 3** 'Peter the Great was a lucky rather than a skilful military leader.'

Assess the validity of this view with reference to the years 1695 to 1725.

**[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.**

**Arguments that support the proposition that Peter the Great was lucky might include:**

- Charles XII turning his attention to Poland after Narva
- Charles' mistakes in the run-up to Poltava
- the Russian winter in 1708/9
- the attitude of the Turks after Pruth
- the death of Charles XII and subsequent instability in Sweden.

**Arguments challenging the proposition that Peter the Great was lucky might include:**

- the failure of the southern Christians to rebel that hindered the Pruth campaign.

**Arguments that support the proposition that Peter the Great was skilful might include:**

- the success at Azov in 1696 showing lessons learned from the failure in 1695
- the lessons Peter learned from Narva and their impact on the Great Northern War
- success at Poltava and Hango; the blockade of Sweden.

Good answers may or may not conclude that Peter was lucky rather than skilful. They may link the two together to argue that although Peter did enjoy good luck, he also ensured that he was best positioned to take advantage of this.

**0 4** 'Political instability between 1725 and 1772 showed the limits to the absolutism of the Russian tsars.'

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.**

**Arguments that support the proposition that instability shows the limits to absolutism in this period might include:**

- the reliance of the tsars on the nobility/the church and or favourites
- 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
- Catherine the Great's position at the beginning of her reign.

**Arguments challenging the proposition that instability shows the limits to absolutism in this period might include:**

- the peaceful inheritance of Catherine I despite confusion about the succession
- the failure, in 1730, to restrict Tsarina Anna's powers
- the developing autocracy in this period
- the consolidation of Catherine the Great's powers.

Good answers are likely to conclude that the tsars between 1725 and 1772 were still largely able to be absolute despite the powers of the nobility and the church. Political instability was the result of disputed successions or because of the failings of individual tsars rather than because the tsars' absolutism was in question.