



**General Certificate of Education  
January 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](http://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

---

January 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 attitudes towards the Soviet regime, in the late 1920s. (12 marks)

*Target: AO2(a)*

**Levels Mark Scheme**

	Nothing written worthy of credit.	<b>0</b>
<b>L1:</b>	Answers will <b>either</b> briefly paraphrase/describe the content of the two sources <b>or</b> identify simple comparison(s) between the sources. Skills of written communication will be weak.	<b>1-2</b>
<b>L2:</b>	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.	<b>3-6</b>
<b>L3:</b>	Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences <b>and</b> similarities and using own knowledge to explain and evaluate these. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed.	<b>7-9</b>
<b>L4:</b>	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.	<b>10-12</b>

**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:

- in **Source A** peasant attitudes are directly and implicitly hostile to the regime. Peasants are complaining about broken promises, loss of freedom, bad treatment, ruination and they show scepticism about socialism
- in contrast, the tone of **Source B** is very positive. The regime's policy towards the peasantry is praised. Peasants are showing their enthusiasm for the regime by joining the collective farms. They are promised tractors and machines. Kulaks are described as enemies, whereas there is no implication in **Source A** that kulaks are considered a

---

problem, if anything the reverse. The whole tone of **Source B**, unlike **Source A**, is that peasants and workers are united, and by implication therefore there is not a problem for the regime.

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

- the fact that there were issues which made the peasants unhappy with NEP agriculture. The recovery under NEP had been uneven across different areas and different crops. Peasants complained about being heavily taxed. They were increasingly unwilling to sell surplus food on the market because there was little for them to buy in return – leading to the 1927–1928 Procurement crisis. Peasants complained that they were neglected compared to townspeople, and despite gaining land at the Revolution, felt that they were not free, were subject to bureaucracy and all sorts of restrictions. Own knowledge should also tell candidates that some poorer peasants did welcome collectivisation, but many did not. The picture painted in Source B is realistic, with the Party representative extolling the virtues of Government policy, attacking the kulaks but also with at least some evidence of dissent
- answers may address provenance. Candidates may query Source A, but since it was not produced for propaganda purposes, being a secret document by people in the know, it may well be accurate. Candidates may rightly see Source B as propaganda, since it is a school book produced by the Soviet authorities who would be unlikely to overtly criticise Soviet policy – although the rosy nature of the ‘meeting’ may well be exaggerated, since the Party man is given an easy time and there is the clear implication that the dissenting voices are a minority not typical of the other peasants.

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

- there is an element of agreement between the sources. In Source A, the mood is anti-regime and not anti-kulak. In Source B there is clearly some dissent amongst the peasants, with one declaring against the idea of collectivisation, which was government policy, and there appears to be some concern about what was going to happen to the kulaks.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, candidates may conclude that there are more differences than areas of agreement between the sources, and own knowledge will probably support a judgement that Source A is overall a more accurate picture of attitudes at this time.

---

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

How successful was collectivisation in creating socialism in the Soviet countryside by 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** Source A suggests that on the eve of collectivisation the peasants were certainly not 'socialist' in their attitudes. These particular peasants do not believe in the Revolution or the regime's promises, they are already bitter about their treatment and have no enthusiasm about the regime
- **Source B** Source B is a piece of later propaganda. It is referring to the promises of socialism rather than the delivery of the promises. The source does not talk about political theory – partly because the peasants might not have understood it, and also the source is a school textbook. The source focuses on material promises – promising mechanisation and the benefits of large-scale farming. But there are also hints of dissenting voices and reference to the kulaks – seen as class enemies and by implication, enemies of cooperative working and therefore anti-socialist
- **Source C** Source C tells us clearly what several of the motives for collectivisation were: large-scale efficient farming, support for industrialisation and modernisation (key features of socialism); the political motive of changing 'consciousness'; eliminating a class (the kulaks) which would be opposed to socialism; discrediting the Right wing in the Party, whose policy was seen as unsocialist by Stalin. Own knowledge will flesh out the extent to which these aims were achieved, and therefore the principal question can be addressed. There is also a clear indication that any means were justified to achieve the end result of 'socialism' – that was indeed Stalin's way.

From candidates' own knowledge:

Factors suggesting that socialism had been achieved in the countryside by 1941 from the regime's perspective might include:

- by 1941 all peasants were working on collectives, in theory for the good of the state and the Soviet people, or were directly employed by the state as workers on state farms
- as far as the regime was concerned, the peasants were happy, conflict in the countryside was no more, the kulaks had either been physically eliminated or were working in towns or labour camps
- also as far as the regime was concerned, the peasants were reaping the benefits of socialism: they had more material benefits, and institutions like schools and clinics on their collectives. They also could enjoy Soviet propaganda and were looked after by their Party supervisor on the collective. 'Anti-socialist' manifestations such as religion had not been destroyed, but had been severely curtailed.

Factors suggesting that socialism had not been achieved might include:

- class differences had not disappeared. Peasants and workers were still different classes. Although life was hard, living conditions in the countryside were often worse than in the towns
- elements of private enterprise still existed. Peasants were allowed to farm on private plots, a concession made by Stalin. Even so, peasants were not enthusiastic socialists – they worked much harder on their plots than on the collectives. There was, beneath the



surface, considerable tension. Millions of peasants had been killed or displaced. Some welcomed the Germans when they invaded in 1941. This did not suggest a harmonious society. The countryside was exploited to provide food for the towns, labour for the factories, and grain for export. Collectivisation had been a success for Stalin in political terms, and perhaps in human terms, because it got rid of 'class enemies', but it was a victory for Stalinism rather than 'socialism'.

Good answers may conclude either that socialism had been achieved or not achieved, and whilst candidates will probably talk about whether collectivisation was 'successful' or otherwise, a high level answer should discuss the issue of whether the countryside had become genuinely socialist or not.

---

**Question 2**

- 03** Explain why, in the years 1924 to 1929, the Right Opposition was unable to prevent Stalin's rise to power. (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 Right Opposition was unable to prevent Stalin's rise to power.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- just like other leading Communists, leaders of the Right such as Bukharin made the fault of underestimating Stalin until it was too late to stop his rise in influence and power. He and other leaders of the Right like Rykov and Tomsky were simply no match for Stalin
- Bukharin and the Right made the mistake of allying with Stalin and being used by him in the struggle against Trotsky and the Left; and by the time the Left had been defeated in the late 1920s, it left the Right isolated and exposed, and an increasingly confident and influential Stalin no longer relied on the Right and was able to turn on it as part of the campaign for a 'second' economic revolution
- the Right's strategy of supporting the peasantry and the 'gradual' approach to industrialisation and socialism grated with many committed Communists, especially after

incidents like the Procurement crisis of 1927–1928 which exposed weaknesses already evident in NEP

- Bukharin, for all his earlier popularity in the Party, was developing a reputation for inconsistency, having moved from the radical hard-line position he had held soon after the Revolution.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might combine their analysis of the Right's weaknesses with comments about Stalin's disadvantages and strengths in the struggle for power – although the focus of the answer should not be just on Stalin rather than the Right itself. A high level answer may not just link the reasons but also prioritise them in order of importance, or clearly distinguish, for example, between factors related to personality and those related to policy.

---

**Question 2**

- 04** 'Stalin's power in the 1930s relied on his use of terror.'  
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:

- terror was clearly an important part of Stalin's regime. The process of collectivisation was still going on in the 1930s, with the liquidation of the kulaks and the deadly man-made famine in the Ukraine
- the Kirov assassination marked the start of the Great Terror, and extension of the gulag empire, and the extension of the Purges in all areas of Soviet society, but particularly in the Party and the armed forces – and even within the NKVD itself
- Terror became an integral part of Soviet life in the 1930s – it influenced behaviour in the workplace, at school, in the home and everywhere. It was also a means by which Stalin reinforced his power within the Party and thereby over the USSR as a whole.

Evidence which disagrees might include:

- some historians question whether the Terror was as pervasive as once claimed. There is evidence that in the later 1930s, ordinary people did not always live in fear, and were prepared to criticise aspects of their lives. The impact of the purges on the army has been exaggerated. Stalin stopped the worst excesses of the Terror in 1938
- Stalin clearly relied on other aspects besides terror to reinforce his regime: the successes of the Five-Year Plans in appearing to modernise and strengthen the economy; the all-pervasive propaganda; the controls over all forms of cultural expression; the social advances in some areas like education and health care. The Party had its own forms of 'control' in areas away from Moscow, and this did not always rest on Stalin's personal control.

Good answers are likely to conclude that Stalin's power rested on a combination of the above factors. However, a high level, balanced answer should certainly consider the role of Terror in this process, and for the highest levels there should be a well supported judgement whatever the final evaluation of the significance of the Terror.

---

**Question 3**

- 05** Explain why many Party members were dissatisfied with developments in Soviet industry during the New Economic Policy. (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 Communists were concerned about industry in NEP Russia.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- although NEP had brought about some recovery from the depths of 1921, there were still problems with Soviet industry after 1924. Although some small privately-run industries flourished, the state-owned 'commanding heights' were not doing well. These industries were inefficient, bureaucratic and heavily subsidised. Worker dissatisfaction was evident in grumblings and strikes. There was unemployment in cities, inflation and higher prices. The needs of a developing economy were not being met. Agriculture seemed to be doing better than industry
- many Communists were dissatisfied ideologically because the existence of some privately owned industry and the profit motive were contrary to their ideological beliefs

- Communists believed that proper industrialisation was necessary in order to take Russia into socialism. Also a strong industrial base was necessary to strengthen the USSR, which existed in a hostile capitalist world, particularly at a time of war scares in the late 1920s. Socialism in One Country demanded a more efficient, vibrant industry, run with the proper political and economic credentials.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might link the factors effectively, clearly differentiating between them but also making links between ideological approaches to industry and a recognition of the practical needs of the economy, or showing a good perspective of the industrial economy.

---

**Question 3**

**06** 'The Five-Year Plans had failed to create a successful industrial economy in the USSR by 1941.'

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 points which agree or disagree with the view that the Five-Year Plans had failed to achieve a successful industrial economy by 1941.



Evidence which agrees might include:

- the Plans did not reach all their targets
- there were imbalances within the Plans. The focus on heavy industry, and increasingly armaments during the 1930s, meant that consumer goods, although increasing, were relatively neglected. The economy could not simultaneously sustain a massive defence capability and a high standard of living
- the emphasis was on meeting quantitative targets, and therefore quality was often neglected. Not all targets were met, for example in modern industries like chemicals
- there were difficulties and bottlenecks in the economy: poor communications and bureaucracy often meant that resources did not get where they were supposed to go; there were mistakes; industry was heavily labour intensive and not always productive despite the show pieces and propaganda efforts such as the Stakhonovite movement; there were many new and unskilled workers in the factories; management and production were disrupted by the purges.

Evidence which disagrees might include:

- there were massive rises in production in the older staple industries like coal and steel
- the USSR had changed from being a predominantly agrarian economy into an industrial one. Industrialisation was spread over a wider area of the USSR. The economy was now capable of massive feats of production, for example in armaments – the USSR was now better equipped to meet the challenges of war
- despite shortages, workers had gained some advantages: slightly better pay and more to buy in the shops, full employment.

Good answers may conclude that in some respects the USSR had undergone a successful industrial expansion, whilst in other aspects it had not. A balanced answer, in order to reach the higher levels, requires good use of evidence and a substantiated judgement.