



# **AGS A LEVEL HISTORY**

## **COURSEWORK GUIDELINES**

### **SOVIET RUSSIA COURSEWORK**

#### **JOSEPH STALIN (1924 - 1941)**



# Contents

Overview of the requirements	3
What needs to be submitted by the student	4
Presentation of work	4
Coursework title	4
Choosing the interpretations	5
Use of footnotes	5
Plagiarism and Malpractice	6
AI and Assessments	7
Core dates and deadlines	7
Appendix 1: Coursework Authentication Sheet	8
Appendix 2: Coursework Resource Record	10
Appendix 3: Mark Scheme	12

# Pearson Edexcel A Level History

## INFORMATION FROM THE EXAM BOARD:

### Overview of requirements

The coursework is worth 20% of the A level. It is internally marked and externally moderated.

Students carry out an independently researched historical enquiry.

The purpose of this coursework is to enable students to develop skills in the analysis and evaluation of interpretations of history in a chosen question, problem or issue, and to organise and communicate their findings, as part of an independently researched assignment.

The main focus is on understanding the nature and purpose of the work of the historian. Students will be required to form a critical view on the question, problem or issue which is based on relevant reading. They will also be specifically required to analyse, explain and evaluate the interpretations of three historians.

### Word count

It is recommended that students write 3,000 - 4,000 words for their assignment with a 10% allowance to be over or under the word count.

#### **Footnotes must be used to reference where key ideas have come from.**

These are not included in the word count but they must not be used to develop the student's line of argument.

Appendices may be included, containing material to which the student has made reference in their assignment, for example extended quotations or extracts. These are not included in the word count.

Students should be advised that if they exceed the word count, it is less likely that they will be able to satisfy the requirement of production of a concise response.

## What needs to be submitted by the student:

- The assignment, which must include a bibliography listing the resources used, and distinguishing clearly between the main three works that are referred to and any supplementary reading. They must ensure that all quotations and citations are referenced using an established referencing system, such as Harvard.
- The Coursework authentication sheet. This verifies the work as the student's own, lists the examined options taken and provides an accurate word count. The Pearson template must be used (see Appendix 4).
- The Resource record. (See Appendix 3).

## Presentation of work

Students must present their work for the assignment on paper. Student work must be identifiable by student name and assignment. Final submission must be in duplicate:

- Two paper copies submitted
- One copy via un-editable PDF, emailed to the coursework teacher

## Coursework title:

**Historians have disagreed about the extent to which Stalin's personality was a key cause of the Terror.**

**What is your view about Stalin's personality being a key cause of the Terror?**

With reference to three chosen works:

- analyse the ways in which interpretations of the question, problem or issue
- differ
- explain the differences you have identified
- evaluate the arguments, indicating which you found most persuasive and explaining your judgements.

## Choosing the interpretations:

The works can be in hard copy, electronic or audio-visual format, but must be created by historians (each work must be by a different historian).

- The works may be from different time periods or may be contemporary to each other.
- The works should contain interpretations that together contain a range of views or emphases. These may differ in focus, methodology and/or perspective, but must be sufficiently different for the student to be able to make valid comparisons and judgements.

## Use of Footnotes:

Footnotes should be placed at the end of each page or the end of the essay.

They should be included when any text is being used or referred to.

When quoting the same source more than once write "Ibid" and the page number.

All footnotes are excluded from the word count.

To insert footnotes click Insert>Reference>Footnote>Insert.

The format for footnote reference is as follows.

### **For Books:**

Roberts, J. *'A History of Civil Rights'*, Penguin, 1995, p 31.

### **For Newspapers, Journals and Magazines articles:**

Smith, M. *'Remembering Martin Luther King'* in *The Guardian* 5 April 2009, pp 3-4.

### **For Internet Sites:**

[www.civilrights.com.html](http://www.civilrights.com.html)

## Bibliography:

The essay must include a bibliography of all resources used.

List primary sources first; then secondary sources.

List the bibliography alphabetically.

## Plagiarism:

Plagiarism is presenting someone else's work (including the work of other students) as one's own. Historical Enquires should, primarily, be the work of the individual student and present that student's own ideas and opinions and judgements. However, such opinions will be informed by reading the ideas of others. There is nothing wrong in quoting from the work of others, but presenting it as one's own is not only morally wrong – it is also a serious offence, akin to stealing someone else's property.

Any ideas, opinions, theories, pictures or words taken from another source need to be fully acknowledged, unless the information is common knowledge. Students should give credit to others, not only for direct quotation, but also for the reuse of ideas/opinions or the paraphrasing of words or specific opinions and judgements, the borrowing of particular facts (such as compilations of statistics) or illustrative material.

## Malpractice

If a student commits malpractice it means that they have failed to follow the rules of an examination or assessment.

'Candidate malpractice' means malpractice by a candidate in connection with any examination or assessment, including the preparation and authentication of any controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments, the presentation of any practical work, the compilation of portfolios of assessment evidence and the writing of any examination paper.

### Malpractice includes:

- **Plagiarism** – copying another student's work or copying from any other source e.g. books, articles, websites or AI. This is cheating and is malpractice.
- **Collusion** – sharing your work with another student to benefit the completion of the coursework. Sharing your work for someone else to copy is still cheating and is deemed as malpractice. The consequence could mean that your coursework is jeopardised.

Students who are suspected of plagiarism or collusion will be investigated and this shall be sent off to the examination board by the examination's officer. The examination board, will notify the Head teacher of their final decision. If the examination board finds the student guilty of malpractice because they have either colluded, the student may not be given any marks for their coursework.

The AGS malpractice policy, which has been drawn from the JCQ (Joint Council for Qualifications) can be found here:

[Malpractice Policy \(Exams\) \(2\).pdf](#)

If a teacher suspects that there has been malpractice but does not report this, they are also committing malpractice as they have allowed cheating to occur.

## AI and Assessments

AI stands for artificial intelligence and using it is like having a computer that thinks.

AI tools like ChatGPT or Snapchat, My AI can write text, make art and create music by learning from data from the internet.

Using AI to create your coursework and say it is your own work is cheating and is considered as 'malpractice.' Candidate's work, which is suspected of using AI, will undergo an investigation through the examination board. This could result in the candidate's coursework being invalid and will not count towards their final GCSE or A-Level coursework.

Do not use any AI to complete your coursework. It is cheating and could jepordise your grade.

The exam boards use sophisticated 'plagiarism' software called Turnit In to identify any cheating. As coursework is submitted to the examination board, any plagiarism will be identified and consequences will occur.

For the full AI policy created by JCQ (Joint Council for Qualifications) please following the link below:

[JCQ guidance - AI-Use-in-Assessments Feb24 v3.pdf](#)

## Core Dates and Deadlines (2024/5)

**The most effective way to ensure that tasks are completed to time and to a good quality is to complete them the weekend before the dates listed below.**

The dates below include tasks that ensure you have a full spread of readings (8 is considered a good amount, and therefore is what you will be expected to independently research).

**The dates below also include the times that the best work you can produce at each stage will receive feedback.** If rushed or barely altered work is submitted on these deadlines, then the quality of feedback on how you can improve will inherently be limited as well. To give yourself the best opportunity to develop your own work and achieve the best mark possible, each hand in must be treated as essential.

Task	Hand -In
Detailed essay plan	w/c 4 <sup>th</sup> November 2024
Draft One	w/c 25 <sup>th</sup> November 2024
Draft Two	w/c 6 <sup>th</sup> January 2025
Final Hand-In	w/c 10 <sup>th</sup> February 2025

## Appendix 1: Coursework Authentication Sheet

### Coursework authentication sheet

Pearson Edexcel Level 3 Advanced GCE in History	
<b>Assignment title:</b>	
Have you received advice on the title from the <i>Assignment guidance service</i> ?	Y/N
Centre name:	Centre number:
Candidate name:	Candidate number:
State the examined options that are being taken:  Paper 1:  Paper 2:  Paper 3:	
Mark awarded	Comments [ <i>Comment box expands as you start entering text</i> ]
Word count	



**Teacher declaration**

I declare that the work submitted for assessment has been carried out without assistance other than that which is acceptable according to the rules of the specification. I certify that to the best of my knowledge the evidence submitted for this assignment is the learner's own. The learner has clearly referenced any materials used in the work. To the best of my knowledge, if any artificial intelligence (AI) tools have been used in the work, the learner has clearly referenced these, and I have taken this into account in applying the mark scheme. I have not solely used AI to mark the learner's work. I understand that false declaration is a form of malpractice.

Assessor name			
Assessor signature		Date	

**Candidate declaration**

I certify that the work submitted for this assessment is my own. I have clearly referenced any materials used in the work. I understand that the use of artificial intelligence (AI) tools could mean that I am unable to access aspects of the mark scheme. I have clearly referenced any AI tools if used. I understand that false declaration is a form of malpractice.

Candidate signature		Date	
---------------------	--	------	--

**Additional Candidate declaration**

By signing this additional declaration, you agree to your work being used to support Professional Development, Online Support and Training of Centre-Assessors and Pearson Moderators.

Candidate signature		Date	
---------------------	--	------	--

## Appendix 2: Coursework Resource Record

### Coursework resource record

Pearson Edexcel Level 3 Advanced GCE in History				
Centre name:				
Candidate name:				
Resources used. The three works chosen for the assignment must be asterisked.	Page/web reference	Student comments	Student date(s) when accessed	Teacher initials and date resource record checked

## Appendix 3: Mark scheme

Level	Mark	Descriptor		
	0	No rewardable material.		
Level 1	1–8	<p><b>Selects material</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A limited range of material has been identified for use in the enquiry and appropriately cited. Information taken from reading is mainly used illustratively and understanding of the issue in question is limited.</li> <li>Judgement on the question is assertive, with little or no supporting evidence, and contextual knowledge is not linked to it.</li> <li>Demonstrates only limited comprehension and analysis of the views in the three chosen works, selecting some material relevant to the question. Surface differences are noted as matters of information.</li> <li>Evaluation of the chosen works relates to their information rather than their argument, or is based on questionable assumptions.</li> <li>Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the enquiry. There are only limited attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision, but the work is concise.</li> </ul>		
		<p><b>Low level 1: 1–2 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects <b>and</b> it is not concise.</p>	<p><b>Mid level 1: 3–5 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects <b>or</b> it is not concise.</p>	<p><b>High level 1: 6–8 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
Level 2	9–16	<p><b>Attempts analysis and explanation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A range of material relevant to the enquiry has been identified and appropriately cited. Information taken from reading shows limited attempts at selection and is used mainly illustratively, but shows some understanding of the overall issue in question.</li> <li>A judgement on the question is given but with limited support and is related to information, rather than specific issues of interpretation. Contextual knowledge is used only to expand on matters of detail in a work or to note some aspects that are not included.</li> <li>Attempts analysis of views in three chosen works by comparison and description of some points within them that are relevant to the debate, but limited understanding of the reasons for differences is shown.</li> <li>The evaluation recognises an element of argument in the chosen works but the criteria for judgement are routine or left implicit and substantiation is limited.</li> <li>Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the conceptual focus of the enquiry. The answer is concise and shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>		
		<p><b>Low level 2: 9–10 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects <b>and</b> it is not concise.</p>	<p><b>Mid level 2: 11–13 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects <b>or</b> it is not concise.</p>	<p><b>High level 2: 14–16 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>

Level	Mark	Descriptor		
Level 3	17–24	<p><b>Explains analysis and attempts evaluation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A range of material relevant to the enquiry has been identified from reading and appropriately cited. Information has been appropriately selected and deployed to show understanding of the overall issue in question.</li> <li>• A judgement on the question is related to some key points of view encountered in reading and discussion is attempted, albeit with limited substantiation. Contextual knowledge of some issues related to the debate is shown and linked to some of the points discussed.</li> <li>• Analyses some of the views in three chosen works by selecting and explaining some key points and indicating differences. Explanation demonstrates some understanding of the reasons for differences.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish valid criteria for evaluation of some arguments in the chosen works and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the conceptual focus of the enquiry, but material lacks range or depth. The answer is concise and shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.</li> </ul>		
		<p><b>Low level 3: 17–18 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects <b>and</b> it is not concise.</p>	<p><b>Mid level 3: 19–21 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects <b>or</b> it is not concise.</p>	<p><b>High level 3: 22–24 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
		<p><b>Level 4</b></p> <p>25–32</p> <p><b>Analyses, explains and evaluates interpretations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A range of material relevant to the enquiry has been identified from reading, appropriately cited and selected and deployed with precision to demonstrate understanding of the issues under debate. Most of the relevant aspects of the debate will be discussed, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth.</li> <li>• Evidence from reading is used with discrimination to sustain a judgment on the question although selection may lack balance in places. Contextual knowledge of some of the issues is integrated in the discussion of aspects of the debate.</li> <li>• Analyses the views in the chosen works and the differences between them, explaining the issues of interpretation raised. Explanation of points of view in three chosen works demonstrates some understanding of the basis of the arguments of the authors.</li> <li>• Valid criteria are established by which the arguments in the three chosen works can be judged and they are applied in the process of making judgements, although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated.</li> <li>• Knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the conceptual focus of the enquiry and to meet most of its demands. The answer is concise and generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Low level 4: 25–26 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects <b>and</b> it is not concise.</p>	<p><b>Mid level 4: 27–29 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects <b>or</b> it is not concise.</p>	<p><b>High level 4: 30–32 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>		

Level	Mark	Descriptor	
Level 5	33–40	<p><b>Sustained analysis, explanation and evaluation of arguments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A range of material relevant to the enquiry has been identified from reading, appropriately cited and selected and deployed with precision to demonstrate understanding of the issues under debate. Most of the relevant aspects of the debate will be discussed in a sustained evaluative argument.</li> <li>• Material from reading is used with discrimination to sustain a considered overall judgement on the question. Contextual knowledge of the issues is fully integrated into the discussion of the debate.</li> <li>• Analyses the views in the chosen works and the differences between them, explaining the issues of interpretation raised. Explanation of points of view and differences between them demonstrates understanding of the basis of the arguments of the authors and the nature of historical debate.</li> <li>• Valid criteria are established by which the arguments in the three chosen works can be judged and they are applied and fully justified in the process of making judgements.</li> <li>• Knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the conceptual focus of the enquiry, and to respond fully to its demands. The answer is concise and well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li> </ul>	
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p><b>Low level 5: 33–34 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects <b>and</b> it is not concise.</p> </td> <td> <p><b>Mid level 5: 35–37 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects <b>or</b> it is not concise.</p> </td> <td> <p><b>High level 5: 38–40 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p><b>Low level 5: 33–34 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects <b>and</b> it is not concise.</p>
<p><b>Low level 5: 33–34 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects <b>and</b> it is not concise.</p>	<p><b>Mid level 5: 35–37 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects <b>or</b> it is not concise.</p>	<p><b>High level 5: 38–40 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>	