



**General Certificate of Education
June 2011**

AS History 1041

HIS2L

Unit 2L

**The Impact of Stalin's Leadership in the
USSR, 1924–1941**

Final

Mark Scheme

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 © 2011 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

June 2011

GCE AS History Unit 2: Historical Issues: Periods of Change

HIS2L: The Impact of Stalin's Leadership in the USSR, 1924–1941

Question 1

01 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 the impact of Stalinism in the 1930s. (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 levels scheme.

Candidates will need to identify differences between the views of the two sources. For example:

- Source A states that officially, all Soviet citizens supported government policies and in particular Stalin personally, by implication without qualification, since any possible expression of 'non-Communism' simply did not exist by 1933. In contrast, Source B refers to fear and apprehension of the regime and its policies beyond 1933
- Source A refers to 'the disintegration of society' by 1933, a situation which 'threatened economic success.' Source B asserts that apart from possibly a period in 1937–1938, most Soviet citizens showed themselves capable of being happy, believed in the regime

and what it was doing, showed patriotism and had the confidence to speak their minds. This is not a situation of 'the disintegration of society.'

- the theme of Source A is that the state, with its pervasive control, was all powerful and threatening. In contrast, Source B explains that whatever problems existed, the power exerted by the state was not the most important fact in ensuring social cohesion.

Candidates will need to apply their own knowledge of context to explain these differences. They might, for example, refer to:

- in the early 1930s there was clearly some overt resistance to Government policies, notably in the resistance to collectivisation before 1933. Also, up to 1934 and Kirov's assassination, there is evidence of debate and disagreement still going on within the Party, with criticism of some policies and even moves to replace Stalin as leader
- whilst there clearly was extensive propaganda and attempts by the regime to control all aspects of people's lives and thoughts, there is a genuine debate about how effective these policies actually were. There is clear evidence that although there were many innocent victims of Stalinist repression, there were still many examples of people speaking out against particular policies, complaints about things going on in the workplace, opposition to the Stakhanovite movement, examples of people subverting the quotas and targets in industry, peasants showing their lack of enthusiasm by working much harder on their private plots than on the collectives
- the regime itself clearly did not trust its own population's loyalty, given the degree of surveillance and persecution. It is also true that certain sectors of the population, such as the Party itself, clerics and generals were more vulnerable to the vagaries of state interference and persecution than others.

To address 'how far', candidates should also indicate some similarity between the sources. For example:

- despite the differences, both sources clearly show that the Soviet state was a powerful institution and did have a significant effect on people's attitudes and lives, although there might be a debate about the degree of impact
- both sources refer to phrases such as apprehension, fright, resistance and control – reinforcing the concepts of totalitarianism or 'control' (although they differ in evaluating the effectiveness of these policies from the standpoint of the state).

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, candidates may conclude that there is evidence both for considerable impact of Stalinism on Soviet society in the 1930s, but also some qualifications which may be made about the impact of the 'totalitarian' outcomes. Given the nature of the sources, whilst it is permissible for candidates to address issues of provenance, there is not much that can be said, given that both are secondary sources by non-Russian authors from the same post-glasnost era.

Question 1**02** Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

How far, in the years 1934 to 1941, did Stalinist policies prepare the USSR for war in 1941? (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.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how important' and 'how successful questions', the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Candidates should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

Relevant material from the sources would include:

- **Source A:** by emphasising how powerful the state was, and by implication emphasising the crushing of any potential opposition, this might be taken as evidence that the state was in a good position to wage war. However, the fact that this is from 1933, relatively early in the decade, and that 'economic success' was threatened, it could equally be seen as a bad sign in terms of preparation for a major war
- **Source B:** references to 'suffering' and 'apprehension towards the state' could be taken as either possible strengths or weaknesses in preparing a state for war. References to 'patriotism', support for the leadership and 'confidence' might well be seen as positive signs in such a situation
- **Source C:** there are several suggestions here that the state was in a good position to wage war. 'People came to behave properly', implying that they would do what the state wanted. The source actually states that the USSR passed the 'supreme test' of war because it was ready politically, militarily and economically for war, without giving any specific detail other than asserting that propaganda was successfully used to allow the state to adopt a 'flexible' approach.

From candidates' own knowledge:

Factors suggesting that Stalinist policies had prepared the state for war might include:

- the ruthlessness and extent of the purges almost certainly wiped out any potential opposition and ensured that Stalin had firm control of the Party and the country
- the Five-year Plans had industrialised the country and, crucially, had carried out a major rearmament programme (which was more impressive than the German one). There had also been some significant improvements in army training 1939–1941
- efforts had been made to prepare specifically for war, e.g. by building plant in the more secure eastern regions of the USSR
- propaganda and the system of state control of industry had already created a 'siege mentality' which made it relatively easy for the USSR to switch almost overnight to a 'total war' situation.

Factors suggesting that the USSR was less prepared for war might include:

- there were flaws in the industrialisation programme: often quality was neglected; some of the plans for the evacuation of industry were very flawed
- agriculture was still a relative weakness in terms of the quantities of produce and the attitude of the peasantry – would they be willing supporters of the regime in war?
- it is possible that years of repression had weakened popular morale, and initiative at all levels had been discouraged
- although the impact of the purges on the military has often been overestimated, they had had a negative impact, as was still evident in the war against Finland
- Soviet military policy was flawed in many respects – there was no effective defence strategy, since the possibility of fighting a defensive war inside the USSR was not to be discussed.

Good answers are likely to conclude that there were a number of positive and negative statements that could be made about Stalinist policies in terms of preparing the USSR for war in 1941. The USSR clearly exhibited both strengths and weaknesses in 1941. Therefore whatever line of argument is adopted, candidates for a high Level 4/5 mark should demonstrate balance and the ability to write supported analysis and a substantiated judgement.

Question 2

03 Explain why Trotsky had not become leader of the USSR by 1928. (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 Trotsky did not become leader of the USSR.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- there was already a legacy of distrust towards Trotsky because of his Menshevik past, his role as commander of the Red Army and his opportunism in switching alliances against and with other colleagues such as Zinoviev and Kamenev
- Trotsky had no strong Party base and even Lenin had criticised his personal qualities in his Testament
- Stalin, with his strong Party base, completely outmanoeuvred Trotsky
- Trotsky had personal failings such as extreme arrogance, he refused to accept others like Stalin as equals and he made crucial 'mistakes', such as agreeing not to publish the Testament, missing Lenin's funeral, and dismissing Stalin as a mediocrity
- Trotsky's policies such as Permanent Revolution and hard-line economic policies isolated him from some of his colleagues.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might discuss how what were seen as Trotsky's strengths in earlier times, such as his leadership in the Civil War, were less suited to the conditions of the later 1920s. They might prioritise reasons and/or discuss whether Trotsky's failures were due more to himself or the successful qualities of others like Stalin.

Question 2

- 04** 'In the years 1924 to 1928, the Soviet regime failed to solve the economic problems facing the USSR.'
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.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence which supports the view given against that which does not.

Evidence which agrees with the idea that the regime had failed to resolve the weaknesses might include:

- although there had been a recovery under NEP, there were still significant weaknesses in the Soviet economy: state-run heavy industry was heavily subsidised and very inefficient; although agriculture had recovered, it was still scarcely reaching pre-war levels; there were still imbalances between the agricultural and industrial sectors. Overall productivity was low
- many Communists were very unhappy with what they saw as the 'bourgeois' compromise of NEP, which had allowed class differences to grow
- particularly in the countryside, peasants were very unhappy with the attempts of the regime to impose a new 'socialist order' on the old ways
- there was concern at social problems such as drunkenness, teenage hooliganism, a lack of social cohesion
- there was a particular problem in 1927 when grain procurements were much lower than expected, leading to requisitioning in Siberia; and a cut in prices led to shortages, as town dwellers snapped up goods
- there was insufficient investment and some historians debate whether NEP could ever have worked in the long run.

Evidence which disagrees that policies were a total failure might include:

- despite the problems, there had clearly been a significant recovery from the dark days of War Communism, even though the USSR remained a relatively weak economic power
- although the Party did not have a strong hold in the countryside, it was now fairly secure in the towns and had begun to address social issues there, although admittedly with mixed success
- although there were strong economic and social arguments among Communists about the way ahead, there was also a basic agreement about the long-term economic goals – it was the timing and tactics they disagreed most about.

Good answers are likely to conclude that there were both weaknesses and strengths in NEP as it affected the economy in this period, and the balance between strengths and weaknesses was partly in the eyes of the beholder. A high Level 4/5 answer should be balanced in that it will acknowledge the fact that there were both advances and problems in this period, although candidates may follow a particular line of argument provided it is backed up by analysis, effective use of evidence and substantiated judgement.

Question 3

- 05** Explain why, by 1929, the Soviet government had serious concerns about agriculture. (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 agriculture caused concerns to the regime.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- despite the recovery of agriculture under NEP, output was still only approaching pre-war levels
- the Communists did not yet have secure control over the countryside, and peasant reluctance to supply cheap food seemed to threaten blackmail, disrupt the economy and resulted in hard line measures like the Urals-Siberian requisitioning
- many peasants clearly did not support the Communist regime
- the regime could not tolerate imbalance in the economy. If it wanted to industrialise, it needed to ensure food supplies for home consumption and export, and also release labour for the industrialisation programme
- many Communists like Stalin resented the existence of kulaks ('class enemies') and saw the peasant economy as a political and social problem as well as an economic one.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might link political, social and economic concerns about NEP agriculture and decide which, if any, were the most important concerns, and why – for example, drawing out the different attitudes of Right and Left within the Party towards agriculture.

Question 3

- 06** 'By the end of the First Five-Year Plan, the Soviet economy was in a much stronger position than it had been in 1928.'
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.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence which supports the view given against that which does not.

Evidence which agrees might include:

- a major start had been made on industrialisation and the basic structure of the economy had profoundly changed. The share of GNP from industry rose from 28 to 41% in the years 1928–1932. There were major increases in some basic heavy industries, and the beginnings of a more modern infrastructure were laid down
- there were particular successes in electricity (production trebled), coal and iron (doubled), steel (up one third)
- the regime succeeded in building up a new workforce – which included women, convicts and displaced peasants
- new technology was acquired from abroad
- it could be argued that the regime had acquired more control, especially over the countryside, with the creation of collective farms, and that this was a necessary step to strengthening the economy in the desired model.

Factors which disagree that the economy had been strengthened by 1933 might include:

- the disruption and opposition involved in collectivisation had significantly reduced agricultural output and resulted in millions of deaths
- important consumer industries such as house-building suffered a serious decline because they were given a low priority
- efficient small private industries were eliminated
- targets were not met in some key areas such as chemicals and transport
- there were major problems such as lack of skilled workers, inefficiency, wastage and mistakes in the allocation of resources; and many major projects like hep stations were often not completed during the First Plan
- there is an argument that much of the First Plan was about exhortation and propaganda rather than real substance.

Good answers are likely to conclude that there were both strengths and weaknesses in the economic performance of this period, whether objectively or from the point of view of the regime. Answers may conclude that a major start had been made, but there was still a long way to go, as demonstrated in the later Plans. Also, there are issues about weighing up social costs and economic costs. A high level answer at Level 4 or 5 is likely to reflect the balance, whatever the line of argument followed, and will show analysis, effective use of evidence and substantiated judgement.

Converting marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion