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**Year 12 Independent Study – March to May 2020**

**Non-Examined Assessment – Practice**

Choose one of the following titles from the Russia course. You are going to write a 2500 – 3000 word essay using the skills you will need in your real NEA on Civil Rights in America 1865-1968.

1. How far was economic distress the cause of the February 1917 revolution?
2. Why did the Provisional Government fail to maintain its seizure of power?
3. To what extent was the Red victory in the Civil War due to Trotsky’s leadership?
4. The introduction of the NEP was a betrayal of all the Bolsheviks had fought for since October 1917. Assess the validity of this view.
5. ‘Stalin won the power struggle because his opponents underestimated him.’ Assess the validity of this view.

Within your essay you need to choose two historians who argue different things about this topic. You are going to explain which view you find more convincing and why, referring to their arguments as well as their background, the context in which they are writing and their evidential choices.

You also need to find 2 primary sources that you can use in your essay. You need to evaluate how valuable they are for a historian studying your question.

This piece of work brings together the knowledge we have studied on Russia as well as the skills you have learned – essay writing, interpretations (Stuart course) and source analysis (Russia course).

You will need to do **extra reading** for this. Use the reading list as a starting point and then use the suggested reading in articles that you read to look at other books/articles/podcasts. You will need to include a bibliography and use footnotes.

**Deadline: Friday 15th May 2020**

**Year 12 practice NEA Mark scheme**

Here is the mark scheme to help you ensure that you are fulfilling the requirements for the practice NEA.

**AO1: 20 marks (essay)**

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity and significance.

**Level 5: 17–20** The response demonstrates a very good understanding of the context and meets the full demands of the chosen question. It is very well organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information is well-selected, specific and precise. It shows a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer is fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement.

**Level 4: 13–16** The response demonstrates a good understanding of the context and meets the full demands of the chosen question. It is well-organised and effectively communicated. There is a range of clear and specific supporting information, showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The response is predominantly analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The response is well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated.

**Level 3: 9–12** The response demonstrates an understanding of the context and shows an understanding of the chosen question. It provides a range of largely accurate information which shows an awareness of some of the key issues. This information may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail in parts. The response is effectively organised and shows adequate communication skills. There is a good deal of comment in relation to the chosen question, although some of this may be generalised. The response demonstrates some analytical qualities and balance of argument.

**Level 2: 5–8** The response demonstrates some understanding of the context but may have limitations in its coverage. The response may be either descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the chosen question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There is some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. The response contains some appropriate information and shows an understanding of some aspects of the investigation, but there may be some inaccuracy and irrelevance. There is some comment in relation to the question but comments may be unsupported and generalised.

**Level 1: 1–4** The response demonstrates limited understanding of the context. The chosen question has been imperfectly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is extremely limited in scope and parts may be irrelevant. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalised comment.

**AO2: 10 marks (sources)**

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

**Level 5: 9–10** Provides a range of relevant and well-supported comments on the value of two sources used in the investigation to provide a balanced and convincing judgement on their merits in relation to the topic under investigation.

**Level 4: 7–8** Provides relevant and well-supported comments on the value of two sources of two or more different types used in the investigation, to produce a balanced assessment on their merits in relation to the topic under investigation. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation.

**Level 3: 5–6** Provides some relevant comment on the value of two sources of at least two different types used in the Investigation. Some of the commentary is, however, of limited scope, not fully convincing or has only limited direction to the topic under investigation.

**Level 2: 3–4** Either: provides some comment on the value of more than one source used in the investigation but may not address three sources in equal measure or refers to sources of the same 'type'. Or: provides some comment on the value of three sources of at least two types used in the investigation but the comment is excessively generalised and not well directed to the topic of the investigation.

**Level 1: 1–2** Provides some comment on the value of at least one source used in the Investigation but the response is very limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalised.

In commenting and making judgements on the value of the sources, students will be expected to apply their own contextual knowledge and perspectives of time and place in order to assess the value and limitations of their sources as evidence. They will be expected to comment on, as appropriate to the investigation and chosen sources:

* the differing perspectives of the sources chosen
* the social, political, intellectual, religious and/or economic contexts in which the sources were written
* the credibility, authority, authenticity, consistency and comprehensiveness of the sources
* the bias, distortion or propagandist elements found in the sources

**AO3: 10 marks (interpretations)**

Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

**Level 5: 9–10** Shows a very good understanding of the differing historical interpretations raised by the question. There is a strong, well-substantiated and convincing evaluation of two interpretations with reference to the time, context and/or limitations placed on the historians.

**Level 4: 7–8** Shows a good understanding of the differing historical interpretations raised by the question. There is some good evaluation of the two interpretations with reference to the time, context and/or limitations placed on historians, although not all comments are substantiated or convincing.

**Level 3: 5–6** Shows an understanding of differing historical interpretations raised by the question. There is some supported comment on two interpretations with reference to the time, context and/or limitations placed on historians, but the comments are limited in depth and/or substantiation.

**Level 2: 3–4** Shows some understanding of the differing historical interpretations raised by the question. They may refer to the time, context and/or limitations placed on the historians in an unconvincing way.

**Level 1: 1–2** Shows limited understanding of the differing historical interpretations raised by the question. Comment on historical interpretations is generalised and vague.

In showing an understanding of historical interpretations and evaluating historical interpretations, students will be expected to apply their own contextual knowledge.

They will be expected, as appropriate to the investigation:

* to show an understanding of the limitations placed on historians
* to show an understanding of the significance of the time and/or context in which an historian writes
* to compare and evaluate differing historical interpretations.