

Sample assessment materials for first
teaching September 2016

Paper 3: Modern depth study (1HI0/30)

**Option 30: Russia and the Soviet
Union, 1917–41**

Modern depth study: Russia and the Soviet Union, 1917–41

Question	
1	Give two things you can infer from Source A about the White army in the Civil War. Target: Source analysis (making inferences). AO3: 4 marks.
Marking instructions	
Award 1 mark for each valid inference up to a maximum of two inferences. The second mark for each example should be awarded for supporting detail selected from the source. e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>They were ruthless to their opponents. (1). Bolshevik village leaders were subjected to execution without trial. (1)</i>• <i>They put civilians' interests behind those of the occupying armies (1). The population was ordered to deliver food without pay. (1)</i>• <i>The White army action may have lost support from civilians (1). The villagers had to hand over produce without pay even though they had demanded that Red Guards should be killed. (1)</i> Accept other appropriate alternatives.	

Question		
2		<p>Explain why the Bolsheviks were able to seize power in Russia in October 1917.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p>You may use the following in your answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • food shortages • the leadership of Trotsky <p>You must also use information of your own.</p> </div> <p>Target: Analysis of second order concepts: causation [AO2]; Knowledge and understanding of features and characteristics [AO1]. AO2: 6 marks. AO1: 6 marks.</p>
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A simple or generalised answer is given, lacking development and organisation. [AO2] • Limited knowledge and understanding of the topic is shown. [AO1]
2	4–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An explanation is given, showing limited analysis and with implicit or unsustainable links to the conceptual focus of the question. It shows some development and organisation of material, but a line of reasoning is not sustained. [AO2] • Accurate and relevant information is included, showing some knowledge and understanding of the period. [AO1] <p><i>Maximum 5 marks for Level 2 answers that do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.</i></p>
3	7–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An explanation is given, showing some analysis, which is mainly directed at the conceptual focus of the question. It shows a line of reasoning that is generally sustained, although some passages may lack coherence and organisation. [AO2] • Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of the required features or characteristics of the period studied. [AO1] <p><i>Maximum 8 marks for Level 3 answers that do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.</i></p>
4	10–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An analytical explanation is given which is directed consistently at the conceptual focus of the question, showing a line of reasoning that is coherent, sustained and logically structured. [AO2] • Accurate and relevant information is precisely selected to address the question directly, showing wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of the required features or characteristics of the period studied. [AO1] <p><i>No access to Level 4 for answers which do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.</i></p>

Marking instructions

Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance (page 3).

Performance in AO1 and AO2 is interdependent. An answer displaying **no** qualities of AO2 cannot be awarded more than the top of Level 1, no matter how strong performance is in AO1; markers should note that the expectation for AO1 is that candidates demonstrate both knowledge *and* understanding.

The middle mark in each level may be achieved by stronger performance in either AO1 or AO2.

Indicative content guidance

Answers must be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. While specific references are made in the indicative content below, this does not imply that these must be included; other relevant material must also be credited.

Relevant points may include:

- Food shortages, which got worse under the Provisional Government, increased the unpopularity of the government and meant that it had little support during the Bolshevik takeover.
- Food shortages increased support for the Bolsheviks, especially as in one of Lenin's slogans he promised bread.
- Trotsky played an important role in the Bolshevik takeover as, in October 1917, he became Chairman of the three-man Military Revolutionary Committee and carefully planned the revolution.
- Trotsky's planning ensured that the Bolsheviks were able to seize the key buildings in Moscow and Petrograd and control communications.
- Lenin played a key role in the success of the takeover. Lenin persuaded the majority of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party to seize power in October.
- The Provisional Government was weak and was unable to win the support of ordinary people in Petrograd because of its failure to reform and end the war.

Question		
3 (a)		How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into the effects of collectivisation on the Soviet Union in the years 1928–41? Explain your answer, using Sources B and C and your knowledge of the historical context. Target: Analysis and evaluation of source utility. A03: 8 marks.
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A simple judgement on utility is given, and supported by undeveloped comment on the content of the sources and/or their provenance¹. Simple comprehension of the source material is shown by the extraction or paraphrase of some content. Limited contextual knowledge is deployed with links to the sources.
2	3–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judgements on source utility for the specified enquiry are given, using valid criteria. Judgements are supported by developed comment related to the content of the sources and/or their provenance¹. Comprehension and some analysis of the sources is shown by the selection and use of material to support comments on their utility. Contextual knowledge is used directly to support comments on the usefulness of the content of the sources and/or their provenance.
3	6–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judgements on source utility for the specified enquiry are given, applying valid criteria with developed reasoning which takes into account how the provenance¹ affects the usefulness of the source content. The sources are analysed to support reasoning about their utility. Contextual knowledge is used in the process of interpreting the sources and applying criteria for judgements on their utility.

Notes

1. Provenance = nature, origin, purpose.

Marking instructions

Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance (page 3).

No credit may be given for contextual knowledge unless it is linked to evaluation of the sources.

No credit may be given for generic comments on provenance which are not used to evaluate source content.

Indicative content guidance

Answers must be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. While specific references are made in the indicative content below, this does not imply that these must be included; other relevant material must also be credited. The grouping of points below does not imply that this is how candidates are expected to structure their answers.

Source B

The usefulness could be identified in terms of the following points which could be drawn from the source:

- It is useful because it suggest that tractors were very important to the success of collective farms.
- It is also useful because it shows that the tractors were intended to increase productivity on the collective farms.
- It is useful because it suggests that collectivisation also encouraged the use of women as tractor drivers on collective farms.

The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe usefulness to material drawn from it:

- This is a poster issued by the Soviet government with the purpose of promoting support for the collective farms.
- As it has a propaganda function, it may well exaggerate their effectiveness, especially the success of tractors.

Knowledge of the historical context should be deployed to support inferences and/or to assess the usefulness of information. Relevant points may include:

- The state did provide collective farms with machinery and tractors and Motor Tractor Stations were set up. However, there were not many tractors being used as early as 1930.
- The tractors were not, at first, as successful as those shown in the poster. Some peasants found it difficult to drive the tractors and many broke down and were not effective.

Source C

The usefulness could be identified in terms of the following points which could be drawn from the source:

- The source is useful because it suggests that the government has taken all the farm produce from the peasants.
- It is also useful because it suggests that the government has worsened the food shortages by exporting farm produce abroad.
- It is useful because it shows that those peasants that opposed collectivisation were treated harshly by the government.

The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe usefulness to material drawn from it:

- The journalist wrote the article from his own experiences of visiting the famine-stricken area of the Ukraine. During his walking tour, he was able to find out about the experiences of those who had suffered from collectivisation.
- For effect, the journalist may have selected the view of one peasant whose experiences in the Ukraine may not have been typical of all collective farms in the Soviet Union.

Knowledge of the historical context should be deployed to support inferences and/or to assess the usefulness of information. Relevant points may include:

- Collectivisation led to a dramatic fall in farm animals and the Soviet Union did not recover from these losses until after the Second World War.
- The removal of peasants who opposed collectivisation led to a shortage of workers on the farms, which led to a further fall in production and famine in some areas.

Question		
3 (b)		<p>Study Interpretations 1 and 2. They give different views about the effects of collectivisation on the Soviet Union in the years 1928–41. What is the main difference between the views? Explain your answer, using details from both interpretations.</p> <p>Target: Analysis of interpretations (how they differ). AO4: 4 marks.</p>
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited analysis of the interpretations is shown by the extraction or paraphrase of some content, but differences of surface detail only are given, or a difference of view is asserted without direct support.
2	3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The interpretations are analysed and a key difference of view is identified and supported from them.
<p>Marking instructions</p> <p>Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance (page 3).</p> <p>Indicative content guidance</p> <p>Answers must be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A main difference is that Interpretation 1 suggests that collectivisation had disastrous effects, with many peasants transported to Siberia and a serious famine. Interpretation 2, on the other hand, emphasises the successes of collectivisation, especially increased grain output. 		

Question		
3 (c)		Suggest one reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the effects of collectivisation on the Soviet Union in the years 1928–41. You may use Sources B and C to help explain your answer. Target: Analysis of interpretations (why they differ). AO4: 4 marks.
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A simple valid explanation is offered but displaying only limited analysis. Support for the explanation is based on simple undeveloped comment or on the selection of details from the provided material or own knowledge, with only implied linkage to the explanation.
2	3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An explanation of a reason for difference is given, analysing the interpretations. The explanation is substantiated effectively.

Marking instructions

Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance (page 3).

Indicative content guidance

Answers must be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive. The examples below show different approaches to explaining difference, any one of which may be valid. Other valid material must be credited.

- The interpretations may differ because they have given weight to different sources. For example Source C provides some support for Interpretation 1 which stresses the opposition of the majority of peasants to collectivisation, while Source B provides some support for Interpretation 2's emphasis on how the countryside was transformed.
- The interpretations may differ because they are partial extracts, and in this case they do not actually contradict one another – the countryside in the Soviet Union was eventually transformed (Interpretation 2) into huge collectives despite the opposition of the peasants (Interpretation 1).
- They may differ because the authors have a different emphasis – Interpretation 1 is dealing with the effects on people; Interpretation 2 is dealing with the final benefits to the economy.

Question		
3 (d)		<p>How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the effects of collectivisation on the Soviet Union in the years 1929–41? Explain your answer, using both interpretations, and your knowledge of the historical context.</p> <p>Target: Analysis and evaluation of interpretations. A04: 16 marks. Spelling, punctuation, grammar and the use of specialist terminology (SPaG): up to 4 additional marks.</p>
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answer offers simple valid comment to agree with or counter the interpretation. Limited analysis of one interpretation is shown by selection and inclusion of some detail in the form of simple paraphrase or direct quotation. Generalised contextual knowledge is included and linked to the evaluation.
2	5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answer offers valid evaluative comment to agree with or counter the interpretation. Some analysis is shown in selecting and including details from both interpretations to support this comment. Some relevant contextual knowledge is included and linked to the evaluation. An overall judgement is given but its justification is insecure or undeveloped and a line of reasoning is not sustained.
3	9–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answer provides an explained evaluation, agreeing or disagreeing with the interpretation. Good analysis of the interpretations is shown indicating difference of view and deploying this to support the evaluation. Relevant contextual knowledge is used directly to support the evaluation. An overall judgement is given with some justification and a line of reasoning is generally sustained.
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answer provides an explained evaluation reviewing the alternative views in coming to a substantiated judgement. Precise analysis of the interpretations is shown, indicating how the differences of view are conveyed and deploying this material to support the evaluation. Relevant contextual knowledge is precisely selected to support the evaluation. An overall judgment is justified and the line of reasoning is coherent, sustained and logically structured.
Marks for SPaG		
Performance	Mark	Descriptor
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The learner writes nothing. The learner's response does not relate to the question. The learner's achievement in SPaG does not reach the threshold performance level, e.g. errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar severely hinder meaning.
Threshold	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learners spell and punctuate with reasonable accuracy. Learners use rules of grammar with some control of meaning and any errors do not significantly hinder meaning overall. Learners use a limited range of specialist terms as appropriate.
Intermediate	2–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learners spell and punctuate with considerable accuracy. Learners use rules of grammar with general control of meaning overall. Learners use a good range of specialist terms as appropriate.
High	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learners spell and punctuate with consistent accuracy. Learners use rules of grammar with effective control of meaning overall. Learners use a wide range of specialist terms as appropriate.

Marking instructions

Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance (page 3).

No credit may be given for contextual knowledge unless it is linked to evaluation of the interpretations.

In all levels, the second sentence relates to analysis and while the rest relate to evaluation. The following rules will apply:

- In Level 1, answers that meet the requirements only in relation to analysis without evidence of evaluation should be awarded 1 mark.
- In other levels, answers that meet the requirements only in relation to analysis (but that also fully meet the descriptors for evaluation of the level below) should be awarded no more than the bottom mark in the level.

Indicative content guidance

Answers must be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. While specific references are made in the indicative content below, this does not imply that these must be included; other relevant material must also be credited. The grouping of points below does not imply that this is how candidates are expected to structure their answers.

The interpretation to be evaluated suggests that collectivisation was a success.

Relevant points from the provided material and own knowledge which support the claim made in the interpretation may include:

- Interpretation 2 supports the claim that collectivisation was a success by providing evidence that more food was grown.
- Interpretation 2 supports the claim that collectivisation was a success by providing evidence that farming was mechanised with 2 million peasants learning to drive tractors.
- It was certainly the case that by 1940 annual grain output had increased substantially to 95 million tonnes, up from 73 million tonnes in 1928.
- Claims of success for collectivisation are also supported by the fact that the state was able to collect the grain it needed to feed the rapidly-growing industrial workforce.
- Claims of success for collectivisation are also supported by the fact that many peasants who opposed collectivisation fled to the towns and cities and provided labour for the new factories.

Relevant points from the provided material and own knowledge which counter the view may include:

- Interpretation 1 suggests that collectivisation was not successful as it was opposed by the majority of peasants who chose to burn their crops and slaughter their cattle.
- Interpretation 1 suggests that collectivisation was not successful because it led to a famine in 1932–33 so serious that more than 6 million peasants died.
- There was a dramatic fall in agricultural production in the years 1930–34, with grain output falling from 83.5 million tonnes to 67.6 million.
- Claims that collectivisation was not a success are also supported by the fact that as many as 10 million peasants were dispossessed of their farms in the years 1929–32.
- Claims that collectivisation was not a success are also supported by the fact that the human cost was far too high, with as many as three million peasants who opposed collectivisation losing their lives.