

AS
HISTORY
7041/1E

Russia in the Age of Absolutism and Enlightenment, 1682–1796
Component 1E Peter the Great and Russia, 1682–1725

Mark scheme

June 2019

Version: 1.0 Final

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

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, i.e. if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

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

Component 1E Peter the Great and Russia, 1682–1725

Section A

- 01** With reference to these extracts and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two extracts provides the more convincing interpretation of the power struggle in Russia in the years 1682 to 1696? **[25 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:** Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. They will evaluate the extracts thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated judgement on which offers the more convincing interpretation. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion as to which offers the more convincing interpretation. However, not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements may be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show a reasonable understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. Comments as to which offers the more convincing interpretation will be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will show some partial understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be some undeveloped comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6-10**
- L1:** The answer will show a little understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be only unsupported, vague or generalist comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **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.

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 evaluation which may be relevant.

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate or challenge.

Extract A: In their identification of Hughes' argument, students may refer to the following:

- the tension in the period was a factional struggle rather than a conflict caused by the ambitions/actions of Peter, Sophia or Ivan
- Peter was more concerned with his own interests and Sophia did not plan to kill Peter
- the Miloslavskys engineered the Streltsy revolt in 1682, Peter's supporters created the confrontation with Sophia in 1689 and traditionalists used Ivan to promote their interests.

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

- to support the interpretation students might show awareness of the ongoing political rivalry between the Naryshkin and Miloslavsky factions; this might include the lack of a clear successor to Fedor, the role of other individuals such as Lev Naryshkin, Natalia Naryskina and Fedor Shaklovity; the deficiencies of Sophia, Ivan and Peter might also indicate their limited roles in the dispute (i.e. Sophia as a woman, the youth of Ivan and Peter in 1682, Ivan's lack of capacity; Peter's lack of interest in ruling, even after 1689)
- to support the interpretation students might include conflicting attitudes to modernisation and westernisation: this might include reactions to Sophia and Golitsyn and their reforms; the attitudes of the streltsy and the patriarch; support for Natalia after 1689, and Ivan after 1694; the lack of support for Sophia in 1689
- to refute the interpretation students might refer to evidence of Peter's increasing interest in politics during the period: his marriage and the birth of a son; his attendance at the Duma; the development of his 'toy' regiments and their use to show Peter's strength; the Azov campaign; his public challenges to Sophia in 1688 and 1689; Peter's attitude to Ivan after 1689
- to refute the interpretation students might refer to Sophia's rule and personal ambitions: her relationship with Golitsyn; the nature of her reforms; her use of the title 'Autocrat' and increased visibility as ruler.

Extract B: In their identification of Anderson's argument, students may refer to the following:

- Peter and Sophia were the key protagonists in the power struggle during the period 1682–1696 which finally led to a confrontation in 1689, which Peter won
- Peter's greater political role: his marriage to secure an heir; attendance at the Duma; the irrelevance of Ivan during the period
- Sophia's attempts to strengthen her position: the marriage of Ivan; her plans for a coronation; her use of the 'Autocrat' title.

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

- to support the interpretation, students might refer to Peter's growing assertion of his position from the later 1680s: his refusal to acknowledge Golitsyn's Crimean 'triumph'; his appointments of officials after 1689; the treatment of Sophia, Golitsyn and their supporters in 1689; the use of the Preobrazhensky regiment to signal his strength in 1694
- to support the interpretation students might refer to Sophia's rule and ambitions: her relationships with Golitsyn and Shaklovity; her increased visibility as ruler; the nature of her policies; her appeal to the Patriarch and Streltsy in 1689
- to challenge the interpretation students might put the conflict between Peter and Sophia in the context of the political rivalry between factional interests: the Miloslavskys and their support for Ivan (and Sophia); the Naryshkins and their support for Peter (and Natalia); the Streltsy – their suspicion of the Naryshkins, their distrust of old Boyar families and their dislike of westernisation; the interests of the Patriarch and old Boyar families and the effect of this on their attitude to the rival claims
- to challenge the interpretation students might demonstrate a lack of personal ambition in the case of all the protagonists: Peter's lack of interest in ruling throughout the period including his preference of the Preobrazhenskoe, his positive relationship with Ivan, and his willingness to leave ruling to Natalia after 1689; Sophia's tolerant attitude to Peter in the period 1682–89; Ivan's lack of capacity to rule.

In arriving at a judgement as to which extract provides the more convincing interpretation, students might argue that Extract A demonstrates that the power struggle during the period was the product of the instability caused by the deaths of Alexis and Fedor which had left the succession unsettled and led to the development of factions of which individuals were mere figureheads. Alternatively, students might argue that Extract B demonstrates that both Peter and Sophia asserted their positions which inevitably led to a power struggle and that this dissipated once Sophia had been overthrown.

Section B

02 'Peter the Great was successful in transforming Russian industry by 1725.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 suggesting that Peter the Great was successful in transforming Russian industry by 1725 might include:

- the change in the position of Russian industry in 1682 (small-scale; largely subsistence economy to the position in 1725 (the development of the iron, cloth and hemp industries; the beginning of 'luxury' industries such as silk)
- the success of government policy to stimulate industrial development: the demands of war; the use of incentives i.e. state subsidies and threats to encourage enterprise; improving trade links; development of construction projects: St Petersburg, canals, roads; the use of serfs
- changing attitudes to industry: the growth of industrialists; creation of supporting academies; influence of westernisation.

Arguments challenging the view that Peter the Great was successful in transforming Russian industry by 1725 might include:

- the problems faced by some new industries, such as silk and crystal, and their failures
- limitations to the growth of industry: driven by demands of war; the social structure of Russia, including serfdom; geographical challenges; Peter's interference and its effect on industrial development
- the persistence of traditional attitudes to industry: reliance on foreigners; the failure to develop a middle class; the ongoing importance of State involvement to success.

Students may or may not argue that Peter the Great was successful in transforming Russian industry. Students may identify that successes were limited to specific areas, mainly those that supported the war and that Russian conservatism prevented greater changes. However, students may note that given Russia's position at the beginning of Peter's reign, even these limited changes can be seen as a transformation.

03 ‘There were no serious threats to Peter the Great’s position as Tsar after 1707.’

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 suggesting that there were no serious threats to Peter the Great's position as Tsar after 1707 might include:

- the strength of Peter's army, particularly after his military reforms: i.e. the ease with which revolts and rebellions were put down: Astrakhan; Bashkir, Don Cossacks
- the exaggeration of the Tsarevich's threat: i.e. the passivity of Alexis, including his attitude to Peter and his lack of ambition; the ease with which his flight was stopped; Alexis' death and the lack of reaction to this
- the lack of active opposition from nobles, Church or serfs: the acceptance and impact of the Service State; the subordination of the Church including the abolition of the Patriarch and the Ecclesiastical Regulation; the tightening of serfdom.

Arguments challenging the view that there were no serious threats to Peter the Great's position as Tsar after 1707 might include:

- the danger posed by rebellions/revolts after 1707: the need to divert troops from the Great Northern War when Russia was vulnerable to Sweden; the difficulty in controlling distant areas of Russia; the potential for a coalescence of different complaints about Peter's rule, including his attacks on privileges, social and economic distress, opposition to westernisation and modernisation, fears about Russian orthodoxy
- the potential danger posed by Tsarevich Alexis as an alternative ruler: Peter's fears of a plot; Alexis' actions in seeking support abroad; Alexis as a figurehead of conservative resistance; his support from traditionalist boyar families; the perceived threat to Peter's legacy
- Peter's inability to enforce his authority in the face of corruption/resistance/the geographical challenges of ruling Russia etc.

Students may comment on whether Russia's involvement in war in this period was a threat to Peter the Great's position as Tsar. These points may be valid arguments but answers solely based on the foreign policy threat will lack range and will be unable to reach the higher levels.

Students may or may not argue that there was no serious threat to Peter the Great's position as Tsar after 1707. They may argue that it is the context of opposition – Russia's precarious position before the Battle of Poltava and Alexis' position as Tsarevich that makes these threats serious; equally they may argue that Peter's paranoia about opposition meant that the threat was magnified and more about Peter's legacy than his position as Tsar.