



General Certificate of Education

AS History 1041

Unit 2: HIS2E

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

Mark Scheme

2010 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.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2010 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

January 2010

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 B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to Peter the Great's attitude to the condition of his people. (12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

Levels Mark Scheme

- | | |
|--|--------------|
| Nothing written worthy of credit. | 0 |
| 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. | 1-2 |
| 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

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.

Source A shows that Peter was concerned about the taxes he was able to collect from his people. It seems to imply that Peter is concerned about the peasants being over-burdened. In Source B this concern is absent. Source B says that the burden of reform fell on the Russian people.

Source A also suggests that the blame for the burden placed on the peasants lies with their landowners. Peter complains about this in January in 1719 and in December issues an order that no-one should be burdened 'more than is proper'. However, Source B claims that the

burden was due to Peter's policies and reforms – the wars, the building of St Petersburg and the construction of canals and harbours.

Candidates will need to apply their own knowledge of context to explain these differences. They might, for example, refer to the fact that although Peter seems concerned about 'overburden' and blames the landowners in Source A, he had introduced the poll tax on non-nobles the previous year and in 1720 ordered landowners to include all the peasants on their estates because the initial census has shown too few peasants would be liable. Source B also mentions the toil of the Russian people – the peasantry did not just face a taxation burden. Peter used state serfs to construct projects such as St. Petersburg and serfs were also eligible for military conscription.

To address 'how far' candidates should also indicate some similarity between the sources. For example, both sources suggest that Peter's main concern is his reform projects; the condition of his people is secondary, except if their condition might hinder the success of his reforms.

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

How successful were Peter the Great's financial reforms by 1725? (24 marks)

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

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

- 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. **1-6**
- 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

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.

Sources

Source A mentions the depopulation that occurred partly because of the financial burden the peasants were under. This would have a detrimental effect on the state's revenues.

Source B indicates that despite the burden on the peasantry, Peter's financial reforms had some success. At the least they enabled him to complete his major reforms and construct major projects without the Russian state going into debt. However, it points out that state revenues were never enough until the introduction of the poll tax in 1718.

Source C highlights the difference that occurred in Peter's financial reforms over time. Finance was clearly an issue throughout his reign because of the demands of war. However, earlier in his reign, financial reform was piecemeal with a myriad of different taxes introduced on a number of elements including taverns and weddings. In addition Peter sold honours. Systematic reform only occurred in 1718 with the introduction of the poll tax. The source argues that this reform was the most successful as it increased the state's revenues three-fold.

Own Knowledge

Factors suggesting that Peter's financial reform was successful might include:

- There were attempts to rationalize the financial system – direct taxation was split into permanent 'fixed' taxes and extraordinary taxes
- many other commodities incurred indirect taxation, as well as those mentioned in the sources – livestock, cheese, barrels, cabbages and cups to name but a few
- Peter debased the coinage through a reduction of the silver content
- Peter also aimed to protect silver bullion through a series of edicts which introduced the death penalty for its export
- Peter's ecclesiastical reform also raised revenue from monastic estates brought under government control in 1700
- in addition state monopolies raised more money
- Peter's success in raising finance meant that he was able to spend all but one year of his reign at war, completed the building of a new capital, as well as other infrastructure projects such as canals.

Factors suggesting that there were limits to the success of Peter's financial reforms might include:

- the growth in the number of taxes and the need for extraordinary taxes to be levied every year shows that the financial system struggled to cope with the demands placed on it throughout Peter's reign. It also highlights the haphazard 'reform' Peter engaged in during the early part of his reign
- debasing the currency this was at best a short-term expediency when the war with Sweden was at its height
- despite Peter's attempts to increase his access to money and the fact that state revenues increased, he was always short of money: wages were sometimes delayed and in 1723 salaries were cut by 25%. Even with this measure some government officials had to be paid in furs
- the inefficiency of both local and central government meant that Peter was unable to prevent evasion or corruption. It is estimated that about 30% of taxes did not reach the state treasury. Indeed the fear of excessive taxation meant that money was hidden or exported when its circulation in the Russian economy could have been more useful
- candidates could also criticize Peter's financial policy on the basis of the suffering caused to the Russian people particularly the peasants

- in addition, the poll tax which tied serfs to the land even more tightly, arguably hindered broader economic and industrial development, which in the long-term, could have raised the tax-raising base.

Good answers may conclude that Peter's financial system broadly achieved what he intended. His wars could be conducted and infrastructure projects constructed. The limits to his financial reform meant that money was never copious, but its success can be measured by the fact that it proved sufficient.

Question 2

- (a) Explain why the Pruth campaign of 1711 failed. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- 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. **1-2**
- 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

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why the Pruth campaign in 1711 failed. Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- Peter had introduced many reforms into the army following heavy defeat by the Swedes at the Battle of Narva in 1700. His army was better equipped and trained than it had been in 1696 when he had last defeated the Turks. In addition, in 1709, at the Battle of Poltava the Russian army had defeated the Swedes. In this context, Peter overestimated his and his Russian army's capability
- unlike Sweden, although the Ottoman Empire was in decline it still had a population of over twenty-five million and thus a strong military base. In addition the Empire was not expansive and had not over-extended itself. Peter failed to take this into account and underestimated the Turks' ability to fight on their own territory
- Peter had supply difficulties. He wanted a fast war so ordered a forced march of his army but this meant that only limited supplies could be taken with the army. However, poor harvests created food shortages, the heat burned the grass leading to a lack of fodder, and the water was often contaminated

- Peter had negotiated with the Balkan Christians – the Moldavians, Wallachians, Bulgarians and Greeks and in 1711 issued two proclamations inciting them to revolt against the Turks and promising them a Russian supporting army. Peter hoped these revolts would tie up Turkish resources and sap Turkish morale. However, the only revolts which took place were in Montenegro and Herzegovina which were too far away to distract the Turks
- Peter's sources of information were unreliable. The Turkish force Peter faced was far superior to the Russian army: 38 000 Russians marched into an encirclement of 200 000 Turks
- finally, candidates can argue that although one of Peter's main objectives was for Russia to gain access to the Black Sea, the whole tone of his reign and reforms were geared towards the west so his bigger priority was in the Baltic and the Great Northern War.

To reach the higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, for example, the lack of good reliable information not only meant that he was unprepared for the size of the Turkish army he had to face, but also had limited understanding of the political situation in the Balkans and so was too reliant on the support of Balkan Christians which never arrived; or the speed of Peter's attack on the Turks which had a catastrophic effect on his army's supplies was partly because the war with Sweden was ongoing and Peter needed the conflict to be swift in order to turn his attention back to the Great Northern War.

- (b) 'Peter the Great ignored diplomatic methods in the pursuit of his foreign policy goals in the years 1695 to 1725.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- 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. **1-6**
- 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

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.

Peter the Great had number of foreign policy goals which candidates might identify: access to the Baltic, access to the Black Sea, eastwards expansion, raising Russia's status as a European power.

Evidence that agrees with the view that Peter ignored diplomatic methods in the pursuit of his foreign policy goals might include:

- Peter had a fascination with military and naval affairs from boyhood, and did not enjoy a traditional royal upbringing so was not schooled in diplomacy and international relations
- Russia was at war for the majority of his reign: the Azov campaigns 1695/6; Great Northern War 1700–1725; Pruth Campaign 1711. Candidates can use examples of these to argue that Peter the Great pursued his foreign policy goals through the use of force rather than using diplomatic methods
- in addition many of the Peter's domestic reforms were directed by the needs of war – in government, finance, the economy as well as reforms in the army and the construction of a navy
- Peter was always prepared to back diplomacy up with force, for example at the Nystad conference.

Evidence which disagrees that Peter ignored diplomatic methods in the pursuit of his foreign policy goals might include:

- part of the purpose of the Great Embassy was to seek European allies against the Turks. This was largely unsuccessful as Russia was not seen as a significant player on the European stage
- this view of Russia changed after Peter's success at the Battle of Poltava. Diplomacy became even more important after 1713 as Peter was viewed as first a potential ally and then rival by Britain and France
- Russia's growing importance in the region is illustrated by dynastic unions but these inevitably meant more consideration of diplomatic issues was necessary: for example, Peter was forced to withdraw from Mecklenburg 1717 because of international concern and pressure over Peter's growing control over the Baltic
- the number of permanent embassies in Peter's reign grew from only one at the beginning of his reign to over twenty by the end
- in 1717 Russia joined a limited alliance with Prussia and France.

Good answers may conclude that Peter was aware of the need for diplomacy throughout his reign so did not ignore it. However, Russia did not have a strong tradition of diplomacy and nor was it a role that Peter, himself, was comfortable in. Military methods were more important at the beginning of his reign; but as Peter's and Russia's international reputation grew so did the need for diplomacy and so did other powers' willingness to engage diplomatically with Russia.

Question 3

- (a) Explain why Peter the Great introduced the system of colleges into his government in 1718. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit.

0

- 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. **1-2**
- 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

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Peter introduced the system of colleges in 1718. Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- the college system was introduced to replace the old departmental system, the *prikazy*. There had been over 50 *prikazy* but their roles were not clearly defined, many of their functions overlapped leading to confused administration. The new system was made up of nine colleges with clear and separate responsibilities
- the demands of war made the deficiencies of the *prikazy* system more apparent making the need for reform more urgent. The importance of the war in driving this reform can be seen in the function of the colleges – war, admiralty, foreign affairs, state revenue, state expenditure, mines, manufacture, commerce, justice
- finance was particularly crucial to a successful outcome to the war and the college system would mean better accounting, auditing and financial management

- before 1718, when the Great Northern War was at its height, Peter had embarked on more piecemeal reform; systematic reform was possible once there was an opportunity to concentrate more on domestic affairs
- the system of colleges can also be seen as part of Peter's overall programme of westernization and modernization. The college system was partly modelled on the Swedish system. Peter used this system as a model because of his knowledge of the Swedish system and the similarities he saw between Russia and Sweden.

To reach the higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, candidates may argue that war was the determining factor underlying all the reasons for the introduction of the colleges – the short-comings of the previous system, the need for finance, and the capability to attempt systematic reform once the Great Northern War was largely won. Equally candidates may argue that the reform illustrates Peter's wider aim to modernise and westernise Russia – these 'western' reforms can be seen in other domestic policy areas (e.g. church, finance, culture) and in governmental reform this 'western' reform took the shape of the college system.

- (b) 'Above all, it was a lack of planning which limited the success of Peter the Great's reforms of government in the years 1690 to 1725.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- 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. **1-6**
- 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

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Evidence that agrees with the view that it was a lack of planning which limited the success of Peter's governmental reforms might include:

- the first reforms were of local government and were piecemeal attempts to have better co-ordination because of the demands of war: the *voevodas* had some tax collection roles removed and passed to the *Ratusha* in 1699. However, this did not solve the problems and these powers then passed to the *gubernii* in 1708

-
- similarly, in central government, the Privy Chancellery established in 1699 was designed to oversee the finance of the *prikazy* until it was replaced by the Senate in 1711. The Senate was at first created as a temporary measure when Peter went on the Pruth campaign, but then became permanent
 - finally in administration, Peter created new chancelleries such as the Admiralty and Cavalry, and some of the powers of other departments had been reduced: the *Ratusha* replaced the Great Treasury in 1699 and the *gubernii* replaced the territorial chancelleries in 1708. The fact that Peter remained dissatisfied with the results of these reforms was why he introduced more systematic reform in the shape of the colleges.

Evidence which disagrees that it was a lack of planning which limited the success of Peter's governmental reforms might include:

- the size of Russia meant that efficient administration was difficult. The reform of local government, between 1708–1710, where-by the *voevodas* were replaced by eight *gubernii* aimed to remedy this but had limited success because these new areas of government were still too large. Three more provinces were added in 1713–1714 and in 1712 sub-units of the *gubernii*, the *provintsii*, were created. Finally, in 1719, the *gubernii* were split into 50 provinces
- throughout Peter's reign, there was a lack of suitably qualified personnel to fill positions in the government; many did not have the experience or expertise for their roles
- in addition there was often rivalry between officers. Brawls were reported on the floor of the Senate. The ongoing problems can be seen in Peter's often frustrated correspondence with his officers, where he tried to cajole them into greater efficiency. In 1715, in an attempt to discipline the Senate, the post of Inspector-General was created to oversee its work. Peter's frustration with the Senate meant that Guards were eventually assigned and Senators could be arrested
- Peter, himself though, was part of the problem; there is some evidence that officers were often frightened to use their own initiative in case it did not meet with Peter's approval
- many of Peter's governmental and administrative reforms, were based, at least in part, on the institutions in other countries and foreigners often became officers in them; for example, the vice-presidents of the colleges started as foreigners. This inevitably led to some problems as systems were new to Russians who did not always understand the way the system was supposed to work.

Some answers may argue that although early reforms tended to be haphazard, later reforms such as the introduction of the colleges were only undertaken after more careful planning. Early reforms tended to be reactive as Peter's main aim was to ensure that the Great Northern War could be fought rather than to systematically reform government. Good answers may conclude that Peter's lack of planning exacerbated existing problems such as the size of Russia and the scale of corruption, or that Peter's failure to plan sufficiently meant that his reforms would not overcome these existing problems.