

General Certificate of Education

History 5041

Alternative C Absolutist States in Europe, 1640 –1790

Mark Scheme

2006 examination – January series

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 meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting 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 candidates' 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.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's AS History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specification. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for AS.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section C).

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Level 1:

The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and indiscriminating with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

Level 2:

Either

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant but outline only description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but limited grammatically.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

Level 5:

As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

C: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: “What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?”. Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates’ responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid “bunching” of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills:**
generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
- well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid “double jeopardy”. Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

January 2006

Alternative C: Absolutist States in Europe, 1640–1790

AS Unit 1: Absolutist States in Europe, 1640–1725

Question 1

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

Explain briefly the importance of ‘the *intendants*’ (line 4) in the context of Louis XIV’s system of government. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. they were responsible to the administrative council for their province. 1
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. they were responsible for implementing royal policy in the provinces, required to supervise Governors, Parlements, tax collection, conscription etc. and to submit detailed reports on all aspects of their area. Centrally appointed the office was never sold. Colbert, in particular, increased their workload. 2-3

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

Explain how **Source C** differs from the views put forward in **Source B** about Louis XIV’s control of government. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

Whilst candidates are expected to deploy own knowledge in assessing the degree to which the sources differ/the utility of the source, such deployment may well be implicit and it would be inappropriate to penalise full and effective answers which do not explicitly contain ‘own knowledge’. The effectiveness of the comparison/assessment of utility, will be greater where it is clear that the candidates are aware of the context; indeed, in assessing utility, this will be very significant. It would be inappropriate, however, to expect direct and specific reference to ‘pieces’ of factual content.

- L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context, e.g. Source B says that Louis XIV did not control government, Colbert did; Source C that Louis insisted his decisions were to be implemented without further discussion. 1-2
- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge, e.g. whilst Source B presents Louis XIV’s control as limited to small issues and Colbert as able to delude him, Source C shows Louis warning, almost threatening, Colbert not to risk challenging his judgement. Own knowledge might detail the grip of Colbert on government positions, the sheer volume of his

work presented to the King, the role of *officiers* limiting royal control, in support of Source B. Louis' commitment to *le metier du roi*, always charring discussion, government by counsel only, with royal word law, the assertion of authority over Parlements supporting Source C. **3-5**

L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. that Louis clearly exercised his absolutism in government, and even a minister as powerful as Colbert did not challenge it; the view given in Source B is, therefore, questionable. **6-7**

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

Explain the ways in which Colbert was successful in strengthening Louis XIV's government and finances up to 1683. **(15 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations, which could apply to almost any time and/or place, based *either* on own knowledge *or* the sources. **1-4**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Or

Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and contain some assertion. **5-8**

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. **9-11**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit and partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

Evidence can be selected from the sources to indicate Colbert's importance: Source A shows his link to the *intendants*, Source B his significance in controlling finance and influence over Louis XIV; Source C points to the King's regard for Colbert but also to his subordinate role.

From own knowledge, to support ways in which Colbert was successful in strengthening government, candidates might show appreciation of Colbert's offices and significance in the Council of State; his role in legal reform and uniformity; supervision of the intendants and the extension of their role in supervising local government and tax collection. Success in strengthening finances: the Chamber of Justice after Fouquet's fall recouped some 70 million *livres* and reduced rentes from 28 to 8 million *livres*; Colbert had reduced Crown debt by 60% by 1670; as the first Controller General from 1665 his abilities as "the great book-keeper" making him indispensable, especially given the demands war placed on the treasury; more efficient tax-gathering – bringing the 5 Great Farms together, scrutinising exemptions; reduced corruption – 1661 anticipated income 85m, net received 32m; 1683 116m anticipated, 93m received. Crown finance was, indirectly, aided by Colbert's policies to improve France's economy as head of the new Council of Commerce, his promotion of industries and Trading Companies etc. Candidates might also argue that Colbert's success in finance was limited by Louis XIV's conservatism and extravagance; whilst it was Louis who strengthened government by his determined personal rule, Colbert appreciated he was no more than first servant. Other ministers might also be considered important.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to be limited to points on Colbert's positions or assertion with heavy reliance on the sources. There will be greater range and selectivity at Level 2 and descriptive answers will try to link with the question, although judgement on success will be bland. Level 3 answers will display greater accuracy, range and depth. They may focus most heavily on either finance or government but it will be clear that the question has been understood and addressed. Level 4 answers will have an analytical focus and consider the range of Colbert's contribution to both aspects with some attempted assessment of his importance. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgement and full explanation although judgement, even at this level, may still be implicit.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'Polish suzerainty' (line 2) in the context of Frederick William's authority in East Prussia. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. it means East Prussia was in Poland and Frederick William was only its Duke. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. Frederick William owed allegiance to the King of Poland as Duke of East Prussia and the powerful Estates there could appeal to the King against Frederick William. Polish suzerainty ended with Oliva and he could then deal more effectively with the Estates. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Frederick William was not satisfied with his gains from the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. he had not gained as much as he had hoped from changing sides between the Emperor and France. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. he had hoped to gain West Pomerania and the port of Stettin but that had gone to Sweden; East Pomerania despite its size was poor land and, initially, the Swedes retained its possession; the gain of Magdeburg had to wait until the death of its bishop which did not occur until 1680; Frederick William resented being a pawn in Mazarin's diplomacy; resented not gaining recognition of his claim to Julich-Berg and that consolidation of his territories had not been achieved. **3-5**

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. dissatisfaction over West Pomerania was the most important as it coloured all his later foreign policy. **6-7**

(c) 'Frederick William's success in his foreign policy was due mainly to his own character and ability.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. *(15 marks)*

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**

L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**

L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

Frederick William can be seen as bold, ambitious, single-minded and unscrupulous and his ability as a diplomat and soldier in pursuing Brandenburg-Prussia's best interests and growth discussed: flexible diplomacy in changing sides in both the 30 years war and the Northern War and in pursuing the best subsidies for the use of his army; his ruthless efficiency in building that army and its discipline to gain reputation, especially from Fehrbellin. His Protestant faith was a factor in supporting the Dutch against Louis XIV in the later 1680s. The degree of his success was however limited, certainly in his own view, by the failure to gain West Pomerania. Brandenburg-Prussia's weaknesses gave Frederick William little chance of an independent foreign policy. Other factors can be argued to have had more significance in his success. Mazarin's desire to counter both Sweden and the Emperor was most significant in the Westphalia success; the overextension of Charles X's army in the Northern War and his death, as well as French mediation at Oliva both led to and limited Frederick William's gains; Louis XIV's expansionism and Dutch determination to resist created the demand for military support, not the skills of Frederick William; their peacemaking at Nymegen ignored his interests, despite Fehrbellin.

Level 1 answers may consist of limited narrative on the Elector's foreign policy or comment on his character with assertion rather than support. At Level 2 narrative/description is also likely to prevail but be wider ranging with some attempt at valid links, though these may be in the form of bland statements with little support. Level 3 answers will be analytical but unbalanced, perhaps concentrated on Frederick William, a limited period, or other factors. Level 4 answers should examine a range of other factors as well as the Elector's contribution with some limited assessment of the degree of success. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain a degree of judgement as demanded by the question and reach a conclusion.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'the role of the *Generalkriegskommissariat*' (line 1) in the context of the Great Elector's system of administration. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. major part of his administration. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. initially only the supply organisation for the army it became the main tax gathering body, wholly under the Elector's control and ruthlessly efficient; the dominant ministry, almost every concern of government was concentrated in this central War Office; von Grumbkow, its head by 1679 was Chief of the General Staff, Minister for War and for Finance. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Frederick William was determined to create a single administration for all of his territories. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. he wanted to strengthen his authority, build up the army. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the initial weaknesses of his government; to create a single state Treasury; to impose his authority over his separate territories and their Estates; to increase the efficiency of tax collection; to deal with recruitment and finance for his army; to use the army in administration; to implement new taxes, e.g. the *modi generales*; to supervise economic policies. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. arguing that his main priority was to impose his own authority; all other aspects were means and effects. **6-7**

- (c) ‘Frederick William’s reform of the system of government was his most remarkable achievement in domestic affairs.’
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

The question enables candidates to consider a range of policies and evaluate relative achievements. In support of reform of government they might compare the weaknesses of the system of administration in 1640 with the quality of that established by 1688: in central government the 1640 predominance of the Geheimer Staatsrat, the gradual decline in its significance in favour of the War Commissariat and Secret Council; the establishment of the Elector's full control of central government and its extension into the provinces; the efficiency of the military in bureaucracy; largely overcoming the powers of the Estates; the integration of the nobility into Crown service; absolutism in practice as well as theory. His success with the system of government enabled the Elector to maximise revenue as well as the supervision and implementation of other policies.

Other policies might be considered as more remarkable achievements: in particular the army reforms and its finance, both domestic and through subsidies, as this was the major purpose of all the Elector's policies and given the remarkable transformation from the army's 1640 condition by the end of his reign; overcoming the power of the Estates and the revolts in East Prussia; economic reforms, again comparing 1640 with 1688, and the development of trade, communications and industry aided by the policy of religious toleration.

Level 1 answers may consist of limited narrative on one aspect of Frederick William's policies, or general assertions on achievements. At Level 2 there should be greater range and some selectivity of points with some supportive description on the reforms in government, or on other aspects of policy with some attempt at valid links, though these may be in the form of general statements with little support. Level 3 answers should cover a range of policies with some analytical focus on the issue of achievements although not fully sustained and lacking balance. Level 4 answers will be more balanced with a clear analytical focus on achievement and the criteria for its evaluation across a good range of aspects. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgement as demanded by the question and reach a conclusion, if not sustained, on the relative achievements of the Great Elector.

Question 4

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'Poltava was a turning point in the war' (line 1) in the context of Peter the Great's military reputation. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. Charles XII had been defeated and sought refuge in the Ottoman capital; the Russian victory worried the Turks. 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. it was the first major defeat of the Swedish army and the "invincible" Charles XII; overcame Peter's Narva reputation; showed Europe the results of Peter's army reforms; Russian forces vastly outnumbered the Swedish and worried Europe; Sweden on the defensive from 1709; the alliance against Sweden was re-created with Russia as dominant partner; Peter became "the Great". 2-3

- (b) Explain why Russia was not a major power in Europe in 1700. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Russia was the junior partner in the alliance against Sweden; Peter was defeated at Narva. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. because Russia had no outlet to the Baltic or Black Sea it had little contact with the rest of Europe and was considered an Asiatic power; Sweden, Denmark and Poland were the Baltic powers; Peter's Great Embassy had failed to gain support for a "Crusade", the Russian army was considered backwards and ill-disciplined, as Narva demonstrated; Russia had no navy and no diplomatic representatives in Europe; the rest of Europe was more concerned with curbing the power of France; Russia had been more concerned with internal and dynastic issues for many years. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. Russia's relative backwardness and suspicions of the West had led the rest of Europe to underestimate the potential of Russia in 1700 under a ruler as determined as Peter the Great. **6-7**

- (c) '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 statement. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

Some definition of Peter's success should be given and supported; it may also be challenged by pointing to his eventual failure against the Ottoman Empire. To support the issue of leadership candidates might point to a range of aspects such as Peter's skill in perceiving and exploiting the problems of his opponents, his determination and willingness to learn from his enemies, especially Sweden, his forceful and rapid domestic and military reforms to mobilise Russia's resources, his military leadership.

Other factors to challenge the statement should be considered, e.g. the divisions in the alliance against him and the sheer luck of Charles XII turning to pursue Augustus rather than following up Narva, which gave Peter the time to implement reforms; Sweden's problems, e.g. her lack of allies, the over-confidence of Charles XII after 1700, his absence from 1709–1713 and death in 1718, all contributed to Peter's success in taking over the Swedish territories; the Ottoman Empire had been unprepared for the Russian assault on Azov; the Ottoman Empire's better preparation for the second Turkish war and success against Peter on the Pruth and in the settlement at Adrianople can also be used to challenge the statement.

Level 1 responses may consist of limited narrative on an aspect of foreign policy or battles such as Poltava with little or no reference to the question or offer assertions on factors in success. At Level 2 narrative is also likely to prevail but it will be wider ranging with some attempt at valid links, though these may be in the form of general statements with little support. Level 3 answers should offer some analysis with clear links to the focus although not fully sustained and lacking balance. At Level 4 responses will be more balanced with a clear analytical focus on a good range of factors responsible for success and, perhaps, some challenge to the assumption. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgement as demanded by the question and reach a conclusion, if not sustained, on the relative significance of factors.

Question 5

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'the Procurator-General' (line 1) in the context of Peter the Great's administrative reforms. **(3 marks)**

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. it was an office created late in Peter's reign and the holder was corrupt. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. he was to preside over meetings of the Senate in Peter's absence; he was in charge of procurators who were to oversee the Colleges; perhaps most importantly, he was to seek out corruption through the fiscals; essentially the "eye of the Tsar" to spy on the administration. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Peter the Great made reforms to local government. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Peter needed more money/to assert his power. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the weaknesses of the system of government on his accession; after the streltsy revolt. Peter was determined to avoid any further opposition, provincial control was essential; local government could supervise tax collection and, hopefully, limit corruption; supervision of conscription, army supplies; to supervise the implementation of economic reforms; to serve needs of war. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. that it was the logical extension of his central government reforms and to modernise Russia. **6-7**

- (c) ‘Corruption was the most important limitation on the success of Peter the Great’s administrative and financial policies.’
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

What the reforms entailed is important and answers may, initially, consider the reasons for administrative and financial reforms and argue, quite justifiably, that success was considerable. The main focus, however, should be on evaluating the factors limiting success. Corruption as the major factor might be supported from consideration of its endemic nature, using the source; bribery and theft still continued, even at Senate and Governor level; Peter's Draconian methods to deal with corruption demonstrated its significance. Assessment of other factors might include the weaknesses of the original administrative and financial systems and the complexities of Peter's frequent changes in structure; the novelty of the reforms – Senate (1711), Colleges (1718), Table of Ranks (1722) and provincial reforms – Gubernii (1708/13), sub-divisions (1719); the Ratusha (1699–1709) and the Procurator and fiskals to oversee financial policies; the overlapping regimental divisions; Russian conservatism and suspicions of the German and Swedish precedents of the policies; the lack of trained officials; over-prescription on roles and the fear of punishment stifling initiative; the size of Russia; the pressures of war; the opportunities to avoid both the indirect and soul taxes.

Level 1 answers may consist of limited narrative on a few of the reforms with little or no links to the question, or offer assertions on corruption. At Level 2 description of the reforms and/or brief consideration of the limitations is also likely to prevail but it will be wider ranging with some attempt at valid links, though these may be in the form of bland statements with little support. Level 3 answers should offer some supported analysis with clear links to the focus on both administrative and financial policies but are likely to lack full development and/or be unbalanced. Level 4 responses will be more balanced with a clear analytical focus on a good range of factors. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgement as demanded by the question and reach a conclusion, even if not fully sustained, on the most significant limitations.