

# AS-LEVEL HISTORY

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

---

1041  
June 2015

---

Version V1 Final mark Scheme

---

---

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' 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 from [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

---

## 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 students. 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 students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how students have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Students who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Students 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. Students 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 students 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 student 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 students 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 students' 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*. Students should never be doubly penalised. If a student 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 student 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 2015

**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 Stalin.

**[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 students 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.**

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

- Source A describes how Lenin used Stalin as an intimate associate and clearly trusted him, whereas Source B talks about Lenin having 'reservations'
- Source A is very positive about Stalin's qualities and implies that it was his political rivals such as Kamenev and Zinoviev who were more devious in their approach, for political

---

reasons - whereas Source B is more critical of Stalin, at least in an implied way, using words like 'indiscriminately', 'ruthlessness' and 'craftiness'

- Source A implies that Stalin is trustworthy, Source B suggests that he is not when it suits him.

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

- the context of Source A is that Lenin's sister looked after Lenin in his last months. Whilst students cannot be expected to know this, or the fact that Maria soon retracted some of these statements and became much more critical of Stalin, students should know about the circumstances around the succession to Lenin and how and why Lenin had been critical of Stalin and the other contenders
- of course Trotsky's criticisms of Stalin are coloured by the fact that Trotsky was writing as a defeated and exiled politician. Without directly accusing himself of underestimating Stalin and having made mistakes, he perhaps implies that there was a collective responsibility for the failings in this respect. Trotsky implies that Stalin's successes were due to his powerful position in the Party, rather than blaming himself and others for underestimating Stalin, opening the way for him through their political infighting, and almost denigrating Stalin by labelling him as a mere administrator. It is almost as if Trotsky has not really come to terms with Stalin's victory in the leadership struggle.

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

- both sources identify that Stalin was a major figure in the political game
- both recognise that Lenin did value Stalin, although possibly this is more in Source A than Source B
- both recognise that Stalin had bureaucratic qualities.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, students will probably highlight the provenance of the sources, for example the fact that Source A comes from a close Lenin supporter, whilst Source B is from a bitter enemy. Such a discussion can be credited. However, it is not necessary for students to deal with provenance to acquire full marks.

**Question 1**

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

How far was Stalin's rise to power by 1929 due to his rivals underestimating him?

**[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 students 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.**

Students 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.

Students should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

Relevant material from the sources could include:

- Source A does not indicate that Lenin necessarily underestimated Stalin, but does suggest that possibly Lenin was somewhat naive in not acknowledging Stalin's ruthlessness as a possible danger. It might be argued that the source underestimates Stalin by seeming to imply that it is other politicians like Zinoviev and Kamenev who possibly need more 'watching' than Stalin. The source does not underestimate Stalin's organisational powers
- Source B recognises that Stalin has a number of strong qualities, but then underestimates the significance of these by stating that these qualities were more important when Russia was at war, but now that the regime is in power, these qualities are less significant. Trotsky certainly underestimates Stalin by implying that Stalin only got where he did through his administrative position and power to administer patronage – Trotsky is not prepared to acknowledge, for example, that Stalin **did** form theoretical positions which did have appeal to many Party members, and Stalin did not get to power just because he was an administrator
- Source C makes it clear that Stalin's success was due to several factors, and that his colleagues definitely underestimated his capabilities, his capacity for hard work, his determination and his success in winning support in the higher ranks of the Party as well as amongst the rank and file.

From students' own knowledge:

### **Factors suggesting that Stalin was underestimated include:**

- colleagues on the Left and Right spent a lot of time arguing amongst themselves, changing alliances and ignoring a threat from Stalin. Sometimes they were openly dismissive of Stalin's abilities
- colleagues did not appear to appreciate the strength of Stalin's position in the organisation of the Party
- colleagues did not appreciate the strength of some of Stalin's other qualities – e.g. his powerful appeal to the Party through 'Socialism in One Country.'

### **Factors suggesting that Stalin was not underestimated include:**

- there were occasions when colleagues were aware of a threat from Stalin, as when the Left and Right manoeuvred, although they thought they could use Stalin's strengths for their own advantage without succumbing to them themselves



- it is possible to exaggerate the ‘threat’ from Stalin, because it is not clear that Stalin was actually aiming for the leadership right from the moment of Lenin’s death. Stalin later took advantage of circumstances, but not everything was necessarily pre-planned.

Good answers are likely to conclude that Stalin’s rise was due to a combination of factors, including his own strengths and skill, the mistakes and flaws of his opponents, and even luck, e.g. the fact that Lenin’s Testament was not published sooner.

**Question 2**

**03** Explain why, by 1928, there was growing opposition to the NEP. **[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 students 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 NEP was unpopular within the USSR by 1928.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- NEP had been unpopular from the start, especially with hard-line Communists who saw it as an unnecessary or regrettable compromise with capitalism. NEP was increasingly unpopular with many Communists as the 1920s went on because it was encouraging 'bourgeois values' and enabling business-minded people to make money at the expense of others
- despite the initial recovery after 1921, by the late 1920s there were significant economic problems, such as a very inefficient, heavily subsidised heavy industry sector
- many people felt that the peasantry was holding the state to ransom, by withholding grain supplies when they felt the prices were not right

- many peasants themselves were very unhappy with the way the state interfered in their lives, and talked about a 'new serfdom'
- there were social problems such as alcoholism
- there was frustration amongst Party members who all agreed that the state had to work towards industrialisation and socialism, and therefore NEP had to be either greatly modified or overturned at some stage, hopefully in the near future.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, to what extent were political, ideological, economic and social factors linked? Were there both long-term and short term reasons why NEP was unpopular with many people? Had the industrial economy under NEP been more successful, the ideological objections to NEP might have carried less weight. Had the Party been less intrusive in the countryside, the peasants might have been less dissatisfied with the regime's policies by the late 1920s.

**Question 2**

- 04** 'By 1941, Stalinism dominated every aspect of life in 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 students 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.**

Students should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which either agree with the view that Stalinism, however defined, was dominating Soviet life, or do not agree with it.

**Points which agree(s) that Stalinism dominated all aspects of life might include:**

- an answer may or may not include an analysis of what ‘Stalinism’ actually meant. This could cover totalitarianism, the degree to which Stalinism was a continuation or modification of Marxist-Leninism, factors such as bureaucratisation, and so on
- there was a focus on a centralised economy geared towards the production of capital goods and defence products. This centralised approach came to be associated with ‘Stalinism’
- there was domination of all aspects of society by the one-party state, with the dictator dominating the Party; control of all public means of expression and social organisation; a conservative ethos which discouraged any questioning of ‘the system’
- there was a heavy reliance on a combination of propaganda and force to ensure compliance; the one-party state; an almost religious-like cult of national development cloaked in the ideological language of class warfare
- Stalin clearly played a key role in the Terror, signing death warrants and putting a hold on the Terror when it suited him
- by 1941 the Party was clearly in control of the USSR and Stalin was in overall charge of the Party
- events of the late 1930s showed that Stalin was clearly in control of the armed forces.

**Points which may question the extent to which Stalinism did dominate all aspects of Soviet life might include:**

- looking at Stalin’s own role: did he personally control every aspect of life? e.g. there is a debate about the extent to which some of the excesses of the Terror were initiated by the security services lower down the chain of command
- it is possible to question whether 1930s Russia was such a monolithic society: e.g. not everyone was cowed into silence, and there are many examples of people criticising aspects of the regime (although not Stalin personally)
- despite the official disapproval of religion, religious practices still continued
- some of the official assertions, e.g. that women had equality with men, clearly did not correspond with reality
- there is other evidence of citizens not fully embracing the regime’s ideals e.g. peasants who put more effort into their private plots than into the collective farms.

Good answers may conclude that the USSR by 1941 was clearly an authoritarian society, but the extent to which Stalinism, however defined, totally dominated the hearts and minds of all citizens, can be debated.

**Question 3**

- 05** Explain why, during the 1930s, the Communist Party made heavy industry the main focus of the Soviet economy. **[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 students 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 heavy industry was the main focus of the Soviet economy throughout the 1930s.

Students might include **some of the following factors**:

- the Party believed in Socialism as the precursor to Communism, and Socialism depended upon an industrialised society with a large urban working class
- the USSR was conscious of its weakness in a hostile world, and to make the regime safe, the country had to be strong, and this required an industrial base, with steel, coal etc.
- pre-1930, the economy still had a predominantly agricultural base, which was a problem in both economic and ideological terms for the regime. It had to be changed
- the focus had to be on heavy industry to strengthen the country quickly. Light industry and consumer goods might be a long-term goal, but people had to make sacrifices in order to build up the country's strength

- industry was equated with progress and a utopian future
- there were significant weaknesses in the pre-1930s economy, e.g. an inadequate transport infrastructure, and a lack of mechanisation to support agriculture.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, particularly the link with the ideology behind the drive to industrialise and the genuine economic concerns about the direction of the Soviet economy. There is also the issue of short-term concerns (making the country strong) and longer-term political/ideological concerns (developing socialist human beings).

**Question 3**

- 06** 'By 1941, the Soviet Union had benefited greatly from collectivisation.'  
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 students 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.**

Students should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence which supports the view that collectivisation benefited the Soviet Union against evidence which does not support the view.



**Evidence which agrees with the assertion that collectivisation benefited the Soviet Union might include:**

- the regime achieved its aim of securing regular supplies of grain necessary to feed the growing industrial towns under the Five-Year Plans. It also enabled food exports which helped to pay for imports of technology and other necessities
- the regime achieved its aim through collectivisation of securing political control of the countryside for the first time
- although the countryside was poor, there were some social benefits from collectivisation such as the provision of schools and basic health services in the villages
- without collectivisation, it might have been impossible to sustain the drive to industrialise the USSR and strengthen it to the extent that it could survive the 1941–1945 war
- there is evidence that the trauma of collectivisation had at least been partly overcome by 1941: for example grain production rose in the late 1930s and there was more compliance from the peasantry, at least on the surface.

**Evidence which disagrees that collectivisation benefited the Soviet Union might include:**

- economically, collectivisation appeared to have been a disaster for agriculture. Grain and livestock production dropped dramatically in the early 1930s. By 1941, after a recovery, agricultural production was still at similar levels to 1928
- the impact of mechanisation and the supposed advantages of large-scale production proved limited. Agriculture was still inefficient and one of the most backward parts of the economy
- millions of skilled farmers, including kulaks, had been persecuted, imprisoned, killed, transported, or became unskilled industrial labourers, meaning a loss of agricultural enterprise and skill
- man-made disasters such as the Ukraine famine, killed millions, wasted resources, demoralised the peasants and weakened the economy and society.

Good answers may conclude that the arguments about the impact of collectivisation depend partly on which perspective is adopted. Soviet commentators believed that collectivisation ultimately strengthened the USSR by supporting industrialisation, unifying the country and strengthening Party control. Others would argue that the enormous human cost and the continuing weaknesses in the rural economy only weakened the USSR, when a different approach might have produced more positive results for everybody. Some students may be aware of 'revisionist' interpretations which challenge some often accepted views: e.g. the evidence that far from boosting the industrial economy, collectivisation actually directed valuable resources into the countryside, e.g. in building tractors, without much return; whilst a depression in world grain prices reduced the return which the USSR got on its grain exports. However, at AS Level, this level of interpretation should not be expected.

**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](http://www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion)