



General Certificate of Education

AS History

Unit 2: HIS2L

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

Specimen Mark Scheme

The specimen assessment materials are provided to give centres a reasonable idea of the general shape and character of the planned question papers and mark schemes in advance of the first operational exams.

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

Copyright © 2007 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

Specimen Mark Scheme

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

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

Question 1

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

Explain how far the views in **Source A** differ from those in **Source B** on the impact of collectivisation. (12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

- 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. **0-2**
- 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

There is a clear difference between the sources in their attitude towards the impact of collectivisation. Source A refers in the first line to the fact that there was a struggle to collectivise, with resistance from the kulaks. But thereafter the source is very positive. The reference to the leadership of the Communist Party is very positive, not suggesting any opposition from most peasants. The change in the 'whole way of life' is presented very positively. Peasants are cooperative. They benefit from mechanisation. They now have electricity and the benefits of education. There are clearly social as well as economic benefits. Life is 'richer and fuller'. In contrast Source B presents a gloomy picture. The peasants receive no pay, because all revenue is diverted elsewhere. There is no incentive to work, and the reference to 'new serfdom' implies disquiet and discontent. This is taken further: peasants are actually carrying out sabotage and rebelling. The brief reference to the army implies that it is an alien force, possibly there to enforce policies on unwilling peasants.

There are clear reasons for the differences between the sources. Source A is Soviet propaganda, from a school textbook. It peddles the orthodox Party line, prevalent even in the 1970s, that collectivisation was a positive force. The fact that richer peasants objected to it is not presented sympathetically, since they were the class enemy. The source contains fact and

fiction. It is fiction that there was extensive mechanisation. Although there were tractors and some advances, Soviet agriculture remained essentially primitive and unproductive. It is true that electricity became more widespread and that education was provided for most peasants for the first time. This source represents the official line, that collectivisation was a good thing, and makes practically no reference to the disruption and trauma which it caused both economically and socially.

The provenance of Source B is important. We are told that it comes from letters collected at the time by a member of the opposition and ex-party member. Therefore he was hostile to Stalin's policies. We do not know that the letters were genuine. The picture that Serge gives of poor conditions and opposition is broadly true, although the source comes from the early period of collectivisation when disruption was at its worst, and Serge was unlikely to find anything positive to say anyway.

Of the two sources, Source B presents the most accurate picture of impact overall, although both sources are highly subjective.

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

How far did the policy of collectivisation meet Stalin's objectives by the end of the 1930s?
(24 marks)

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

- 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. **0-6**
- 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

Stalin almost certainly had several objectives in implementing collectivisation, bound up with both political and economic concerns. The principal goal of the Communists was to create an industrialised society – seen as a prerequisite for socialism and eventually communism. Agriculture was important – particularly since in a hostile world the USSR had to be largely self-sufficient – but its main function was to be to provide food for the planned industrial towns. Collectivisation was to ensure that the state had first call on food production, and could make the feeding of the industrial workforce and army the main priorities. NEP had helped the USSR recover from the ravages of Civil War and War Communism, and many peasants had done well since 1921. However, the economy had in many respects only returned to pre-war levels. The 1923 Scissors crisis and the reluctance of peasants to release cheap grain on to the market had forced the regime to revert to requisitioning – the ‘Urals-Siberian method’ – in the late 1920s. Stalin could not afford for the state to be held to ransom. Political motives were also bound up with these concerns. Communists had never trusted the peasants: they were too independent, conservative, and concerned with making a profit from their own land. The Communists were mainly urban-based and had a limited presence in the countryside. Collective and state farms would eliminate small independent farms in favour of large organisations under party control.

The regime also hoped that large farms would benefit from mechanisation, with increased output. Stalin also wanted to use grain as exports, to pay for the import of industrial goods and expertise necessary for the industrial programme. Mixed up with this was the campaign against the kulaks – conveniently identified as a class enemy, and a scapegoat for the USSR’s perceived ills.

Collectivisation met some of Stalin’s objectives. He secured party control over the countryside: never again did peasants pose a serious threat to the regime. He secured grain for export, and workers in the towns were fed. Displaced peasants also comprised an important part of the growing urban workforce. Millions of peasants starved (especially in the Ukraine famine), were sent to labour camps or to cities. Although Stalin recognised that this involved a ‘terrible struggle’, he was not concerned with the humanitarian aspects. In terms of economic output, Stalin was less successful. The trauma of forced collectivisation and peasant resistance meant that agricultural production fell and only recovered in the mid 1930s. Yields remained low, and mechanisation had limited success. Peasants worked harder on their individual private plots (a Stalinist concession) than on collectives. Agriculture remained a major weakness of the economy. However, the main objectives of controlling the peasantry and feeding the towns were achieved, and so industrialisation could go ahead. Therefore it is possible to argue that in different respects collectivisation was a success, a qualified success or a failure.

Source A reports on the positive economic and social benefits of collectivisation, although it makes no specific reference to increases in output – but this source is Soviet propaganda, and tells us little about the difficulties and overall impact of the process. Source B refers directly to the failures and the opposition. Whilst some of the claims are true, this source comes from an opponent of the regime, and it is from 1930 and 1931, when collectivisation was in its early stages. Source C gives a clear picture of economic impact. The grain harvest fell drastically between 1930 and 1932 during the chaos of collectivisation. Livestock numbers fell even more drastically, from 1928 onwards (often killed by peasants themselves as a protest against

requisitioning). Production only began to recover by 1935. Therefore Source C seems to suggest that the objective of improved production was not met until the later 1930s. Although this is a Soviet source, the statistics cannot be simply dismissed – if they were pure propaganda, they would presumably have shown a rosier picture.

Therefore both the sources and own knowledge can be used to give various answers to the question of how successful collectivisation actually was.

Question 2

- (a) Explain why the Great Terror was carried out in the USSR in the years 1934 to 1939.

(12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

- 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. **0-2**
- 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

This question is taking the Terror as beginning with the aftermath of Kirov's assassination, although there were previous examples of repression (e.g. the Shakhty trials).

Kirov was popular, head of the Leningrad Party and a close colleague of Stalin. At the 17th Party Congress of 1934 he stood for election as General Secretary, and probably won, but Stalin fixed the result in his own favour. Shortly afterwards Kirov was assassinated at his HQ. Stalin may have been implicated – the assassin was killed and other evidence destroyed. Stalin used the assassination to purge the Party (many were expelled). Then leading old Bolsheviks were given Show Trials, including Kamenev and Zinoviev in 1936 and Bukharin, Rykov and ex-NKVD chief Yagoda in 1938. Tukhachevsky and many other Army commanders were tried and shot in 1937. Many ordinary people were also arrested, put in labour camps, exiled or killed, for a range of 'crimes' including Trotskyism, sabotage, anti-Soviet activity. The NKVD carried out the Purges, although its head Yezhov was purged and replaced by Beria, and the Terror relaxed in 1939. Various reasons for Stalin instituting the Terror have been given: Stalin's paranoia, his desire for vengeance on old opponents, his desire for absolute power, his desire

to make scapegoats for errors and to drive the population through the economic revolution, the fear of foreign enemies, including Germany. There is also a debate about the degree to which Stalin controlled the Terror personally, and the degree to which it also grew through the enthusiasm of local party activists and thereby gained its own momentum.

- (b) 'By 1941, the results of the Great Terror had fully met Stalin's aims in implementing it.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

- 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. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-6**
- 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. 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 awareness 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 will show an awareness of historical debate. 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. There will be an appreciation of historical discussion and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

There is a lot of debate about the numerical impact of the Terror, partly depending on whether the peasants are included. But the figures of imprisoned or killed probably ran into several millions.

The impact other than in numbers is also subject to debate. For example, the Red Army lost many experienced officers shortly before a devastating war, although reforms were carried out in the army before 1941 and many sacked officers were reinstated. The reluctance of many Red Army officers to show initiative in the early stages of the German attack in 1941 was in large part prompted by fear resulting from the purges.

The impact on everyday life is also a subject for debate. The purges affected Party members, the intelligentsia, managers and other higher profile people more than many ordinary citizens.

Although fear of terror, along with propaganda, was a Government weapon, many ordinary workers were not browbeaten into submission. For example, they continued to change jobs and stand up for guaranteed working rights.

Did Stalin meet his objectives? If he wanted to take revenge on old colleagues, he achieved this; if there was German influence in the Red Army, and possibly even an anti-Stalin army plot, this was certainly nipped in the bud. If Stalin wanted to create a siege mentality in the Soviet people and encourage greater effort, he at least partially succeeded. If Stalin wanted to increase his personal power over the party, he succeeded. If he wanted the labour camp system to contribute significantly to the economy, he only partially succeeded. The purges were disruptive, but Stalin and his 'system' survived the war which followed, and it may be that the siege mentality created by the purges was an important factor in that victory. The impact upon the party was massive. The dictatorship of the party became Stalin's dictatorship over the party. There were certainly no more significant opponents for Stalin. Party organisations became less significant. The NKVD had more power.

Therefore it should be possible to argue a case that Stalin's objectives were either fully or partially met.

Question 3

- (a) Explain why a series of industrial plans was launched in the USSR in the years 1928 to 1938. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

- 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. **0-2**
- 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

Industrialisation had always been a Communist goal: it was seen as essential to creating socialism. Any controversy was purely about the methods of achieving it. Planners were at work in the late 1920s, and rational plans were produced in 1928 and 1929, but at that very

moment most of the professional planners were sacked or even put on trial, and 'planning' rapidly became mostly an outpouring of propaganda and a setting of fanciful targets divorced from reality. The leadership declared that the first plan was fulfilled in 4 years in 1932 (in fact some of the target figures were not reached until 1960).

The emphasis was on massive projects like the Magnitogorsk industrial city, Hydro Electrical Power stations, railways and canals like the White Sea Canal. Class A industries (producers' goods like coal, steel, machine tools) were given prominence over Class B ones (including consumer goods). Class A industries showed big increases in production, because they got priority in resources – although statistics were distorted and quality was often poor. Soviet figures suggest an annual 19% growth rate during the first plan. Whatever the truth, an industrial base was certainly laid. Much depended on the expansion of the work force, especially women, plus the efforts of displaced peasants and slave labour. Despite the fact that the work force more than doubled (1928 – 11.5 million; 1932 – 24 million), there was still a shortage of labour. Living standards suffered because many consumer goods were in short supply.

The Second Plan (1932–1937) was less chaotic. Soviet figures (again overstated) suggest a doubling of national income and output, although pace slackened towards the end. In the Third Plan (from 1938) more attention was paid to defence and quality of goods.

The USSR was certainly industrialised by 1941, although there had been uneven development and a heavy reliance on basic goods.

- (b) 'The Five-Year Plans resulted in remarkable industrial growth.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this judgement. (24 marks)

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

- 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. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-6**
- 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. 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 awareness 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 will show an awareness of historical debate. 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. There will be an appreciation of historical discussion and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Whatever debate there is about the nature and extent of industrial growth in this period, there were clearly major developments in the production of capital goods. This had several implications. It meant the growth of urbanisation – the development of existing towns and growth of new ones; changing work patterns; the growth of a labour camp complex to contribute to economic growth. Answers may also consider other aspects, although these are not obligatory: for example there were also large social implications, e.g. the massive rise in the employment of women. These changes had both positive and negative effects on the population. There was certainly a lot of misery, especially if the impact of collectivisation on the peasantry and the impact of the purges are added to the equation, as they can be legitimately, since they were an integral part of Stalin's drive towards an industrial society.

Specific factors which can be included are:

The emphasis on planning for growth: although the Plans did little more than set arbitrary targets:

- An emphasis on great prestige projects such as the Dnieper Dam and the Turksib Railway
- A dramatic increase in the production of capital goods such as coal, steel, cement
- A corresponding lack of emphasis on consumer goods, at least before 1937 - there was a shift from consumption to investment
- An overall significantly high growth rate – difficult to be exact, but possibly between 4-12 per cent a year
- The USSR's economic standing in relation to other Powers altered significantly;
- There was rapid urbanisation
- There was a significant emphasis on defence production, especially after 1937;
- In contrast, agricultural production lagged behind
- A major factor in growth was the fact that people were made to work hard, there was a big influx of women and peasants into the workforce, and slave labour from the gulags also contributed to industrial growth; there were also material incentives and propaganda campaigns
- The main emphasis was on quantity, not quality. Expansion was rapid because the USSR was starting from a low base and early economic growth was not sophisticated. This later caused problems, but at least the Soviet economy was able to 'take off', and it shifted from a rural to an urbanised, industrial economy.

It is not required to comment upon social impact, but credit can be given to mention of related factors such as:

- Industrialisation ended the unemployment of the 1920s. There was now a labour shortage
- After rationing finished (1935) real wages in the cities rose
- It was possible for motivated workers to achieve bonuses
- There is evidence that working conditions improved. Workers were still able to change jobs
- There were advances in education

- Most people in the towns were fed, although housing conditions and social services were poor.

Any reasoned argument about the impact of the Plans can be credited.