



Questions & Answers

Understanding Standards Higher History

Question paper 2 webinar

In the source points, do candidates not need to make a comment on how the information is true/accurate?

No, candidates do not need to make a comment on if the information is true or accurate. Candidates are required to write an evaluative comment which links to the question asked to gain source marks for the evaluate the usefulness question.

For recall should we be encouraging candidates to explicitly say that the omission makes the source less useful due to the omission? Or is that not necessary?

It is not essential to say the source is less useful, however, it is good practice to introduce recall with comments such as, 'however the source does not tell us everything' or 'the source is limited/less useful' etc.

Would you encourage candidates to add own knowledge to source points or just ensure they have solid interpretation?

It is not required for candidates to add recall when developing source marks. Some do this to enhance their explanation, however, it is not essential.

In an evaluate the usefulness question, are candidates required to provide hugely detailed points for significant omission?

There is no limit on how much a candidate should or should not write with regard recall for any question stem. This most important thing is to ensure that what they have written answers the question asked and is explained. Candidates do not need to link back to the question for recall points, but it is good practice.

In the Scottish Wars of Independence section – when they are quoting the source – when rewording do they need further information or just rewording?

It is not required for candidates to add recall when developing source marks. Some do this to enhance their explanation, however, it is not essential. When explaining the quote, the most important thing is that candidates show understanding of the question asked.

Can you please clarify that the candidate does not need to state (in the own knowledge/source omission) sentences that ‘the source is less useful as it fails to mention ...’

It is not essential to say the source is less useful, however, it is good practice to introduce recall with comments such as ‘however the source does not tell us everything’ or ‘the source is limited/less useful’ etc.

Do they have to use the word ‘accurately’ when interpreting the source?

No, there are no set words or terms required when interpreting sources. The most important thing is for the source interpretation to answer the question asked.

Can you clarify whether they need to use full quotes to gain the mark?

It is good practice to use full quotes. However, candidates can shorten quotes as long as their explanation shows an understanding of the question asked.

Should candidates add more to source points, or should they just reword the quote?

It is not required for candidates to add recall when developing source marks. Some do this to enhance their explanation, however, it is not essential. When explaining the quote, the most important thing is that candidates show understanding of the question asked.

If evidence from one descriptor is relevant to another, why can’t it be credited similar to the ‘Any other relevant point’ in the essays?

The purpose of the sub issues is to make them narrower. If any recall is allowed, then it is merely the full issue and not a sub issue.

Can source interpretation points be concise?

When explaining the quote, the most important thing is that candidates show understanding of the question asked. This can be done in a few, or many words.

For the question ‘Evaluate the usefulness of Source A as evidence of why so many Scots volunteered to fight during the war’ (Question 17: question paper 2 2024), if they discussed the notion of the sense of adventure and opportunity to leave Scotland is this still too generic?

This point above would be awarded. For example, a similar point was awarded this year:

‘The source fails to mention that some Scots volunteered to fight during the war because they had the chance to earn a steady wage which meant they could provide for their families and help them out of poverty.’

For the question ‘Evaluate the usefulness of Source A as evidence of why so many Scots volunteered to fight during the war’ (Question 17: question paper 2 2024), if the candidate stated the idea of the short war theory and quoted a soldier from the Black watch in their recall, would this still gain the mark?

This point above would be awarded as long as the candidate said Scots, they would not need a quote from a soldier.

Can candidates receive 2 marks if they make two evaluative comments on one aspect of the source? For example, why a particular newspaper article is useful and less useful?

As the marking instructions show, only 1 mark is available for each rubric mark.

When explaining a point in a source is it preferable to bring in your own knowledge?

It is not required for candidates to add recall when developing source marks. Some do this to enhance their explanation, however, it is not essential. When explaining the quote, the most important thing is that that candidates show understanding of the question asked.

When using recall in interpretation/content does that also get credited as omission/recall?

It is not required for candidates to add recall when developing source marks. Some do this to enhance their explanation, however, it is not essential. When explaining the quote, the most important thing is that candidates show understanding of the question asked. If a candidate adds recall to enhance their interpretation, then it can only be awarded interpretation marks, not recall marks.

How much information/detail is needed for it to be considered ‘correct, relevant detail’ in an omission point?

There is no limit on how much a candidate should or should not write with regard recall for any question stem. This most important thing is to ensure that what they have written answers the question asked and is explained. Candidates do not need to link back to the question for recall points, but it is good practice.

Could there be a 2-source question about the reaction of the Scots to Italian immigrants? or Jewish immigrants? or Lithuanian immigrants?

The course specification was updated and this involved standardising the number of bullet points across the sections to have greater parity. There was no change to course content.

In response to question 14 of the 2024 question paper, if candidates had written that employers had a positive reaction to Irish immigrants as they were seen as a cheap labour source in order to construct railways/canals/Glasgow tube, would this have been valid?

The examples above are fine as they would link to a reaction. This year’s candidates said that Irish took on jobs such as building the Glasgow Subway or the Irish created Celtic

Football Club. They made no reference to the reaction of Scots to Celtic being created or the Scots reaction to the Irish working on the building of the subways.

Are we to ignore the updated course specification for Migration and Empire? 'Reaction of Scots' to immigrant groups is not in the description of content. My understanding was that the wording of questions for evaluate or two-source questions had to be lifted from one description of content item.

The course specification was updated and this involved standardising the number of bullet points across the sections to have greater parity. There was no change to course content.

Could other areas of Migration and Empire be narrowed in two ways, for example, the impact of Scots on economy and enterprise in Canada or the Impact of Scots on the natives in Australia?

The course specification was updated and this involved standardising the number of bullet points across the sections to have greater parity. There was no change to course content.

If the course specification now just says experience of Irish immigrants, are there unspecified elements (such as Scottish reaction) that could be specifically asked about?

The course specification was updated and this involved standardising the number of bullet points across the sections to have greater parity. There was no change to course content.

For clarity, with the change to the course specification the expectation was that the sub-section of issues, for example issue 2 Migration and Empire would be the focus of targeted questions like evaluate and two-source. Is it the case that other variations such as reaction are to be expected in future years?

The course specification was updated and this involved standardising the number of bullet points across the sections to have greater parity. There was no change to course content.

The specimen question paper and associated marking instructions were published in September 2023 to exemplify the updated course specification. There was no change to course content and key issue 2 in Migration and Empire remained as 'The experience of immigrants in Scotland'. The marking instructions include examples of Scots' reactions to immigrants, which is part of the experience of immigrants, illustrating that this topic remains part of the course and should be taught. Therefore, its inclusion in the exam is valid.

For Part 3 Migration and Empire, could you have a question about the impact the Scots had on education in Australia, or would it just be about the impact on Australia?

The course specification was updated and this involved standardising the number of bullet points across the sections to have greater parity. There was no change to course content. However, nothing so specific would be asked in this area.

In the 2024 exam, the Migration and Empire Issue 2 question was the ONLY one that deviated from the specific points in the description of content. How can there be parity if you are deviating from the course descriptor?

The course specification was updated and this involved standardising the number of bullet points across the sections to have greater parity. There was no change to course content. The specimen question paper and associated marking instructions were published in September 2023 to exemplify the updated course specification. There was no change to course content and key issue 2 in Migration and Empire remained as 'The experience of immigrants in Scotland'. The marking instructions include examples of Scots' reactions to immigrants, which is part of the experience of immigrants, illustrating that this topic remains part of the course and should be taught. Therefore, its inclusion in the exam is valid.

For more specifically Scottish topics, the 'Scottishness' of examples is less relevant but there is the sense that examples need specific named people, not just examples of eg jobs (say nursing), I suppose this is because otherwise it's not Scottish enough? Would this transfer over to War of Independence, Treaty of Union etc? Do we need them to give names of people to get the recall marks?

With regard the Treaty of Union topic, you would be expecting candidates to be aware of the names of the legislation passed by either the Scottish or English parliaments and the impact of these.

For the Great War are we safe to assume topics that have been in previous course specifications, for example DORA and changing prices for food etc won't be asked specifically?

The course specification was updated and this involved standardising the number of bullet points across the sections to have greater parity. There was no change to course content.

To clarify, do candidates need the overall viewpoints for each source to access all the marks?

For questions that ask 'How much do Sources ... reveal about differing interpretations of' (10 marks), candidates must **interpret** the view of each source and use recalled knowledge to assess what the sources reveal about differing interpretations of a historical issue.

- ◆ **A maximum of 2 interpretation marks** can be awarded per source (4 in total) (these must be explained and show understanding of the interpretation given) **(I)**
- ◆ **A maximum of 2 marks are also available for a clear overall viewpoint** of each source (1 mark per source, again must show understanding of the viewpoint in each source) **(OV)**
- ◆ A maximum of 6 recall marks can be awarded **(K)**

Example candidate response:

- ◆ The candidate does not attempt overall viewpoint **(OV)** (0 marks)
- ◆ Two explained interpretations **(I)** are given from each source (4 marks)
- ◆ The candidate provides 6 recall **(R)** and gains 10 out of 10

Is it possible some (many?) of your markers took the additional detail in each example in the marking instructions as indicating the new standard, even if that's not what the team meant them to do?

No, at standardisation the same processes were carried out to set the national standard. The increase in detail in the marking instructions was to give markers more examples to help with their marking. It was not creating a new standard.

How many marks can candidates be awarded for interpretations for the two-source question? Two or three from each source?

- ◆ **A maximum of 2 interpretation marks** can be awarded per source (4 in total) (these must be explained and show understanding of the interpretation given) **(I)**
- ◆ **A maximum of 2 marks are also available for a clear overall viewpoint** of each source (1 mark per source, again must show understanding of the viewpoint in each source) **(OV)**

If a candidate in Migration and Empire gives a great explanation of an impact that Scots had on the Empire, and then tries to give a specific named example as supplementary evidence and gets the name wrong, will they be given a mark if the explanation was valid and only the name was wrong?

If a clear explanation is given without a named example, then the candidate will be awarded a mark.

Do you want the stem of the question each time?

It is good practice for students to use the words of the question. However, there is no requirement. To say 'another impact was' would be fine as long as information that followed linked to the question.

In question 19 of the 2024 question paper, do they need the percentage '25%' or the exact number of ships '481' to get the marks?

One impact the war had on Scottish industry was there was an increased demand for horse feed as they were vital for easy travel and warfare. This is supported by the fact that acreage for oats in Scotland increased by 25%. **(A recall mark is awarded as the candidate has given a specific Scottish example of the impact the war had on industry and the economy.)**

Another impact the war had on Scottish industry was there was an increased demand for shipbuilding as it was necessary for naval warfare. This is supported by the fact that 481 ships were built in the Clyde during the war. **(A recall mark is awarded as the candidate has given a Scottish example of the impact the war had on industry and the economy.)**

Yes, the figures add the Scottish detail required.

For question 15 of the 2024 question paper would this get a mark? ‘Scots had an impact on the political life in Canada. A Scot was the first Prime Minister of Canada.’

Yes, as the candidate has stated that Scots made an impact on political life. They have done more than say ‘a Scot was Prime Minister.’

‘Scots had an impact on Canada as they helped develop the fur trade’. Is this enough for a mark? (Question 15 of the 2024 question paper)

This is not enough as the candidate has not stated what the impact of the fur trade was on Canada.

For example, would the Merino sheep importation to Australia need a Scottish name?

If the candidate gave a well explained example highlighting the impact of this on Australia, then this mark could be awarded without a named example.

For question 15 of the 2024 question paper, can you get different marks for curling, another point for Burns suppers and Highland games considering the impacts all link to cultural? Could this have 3 marks if in three different points?

Yes. If they are well explained, then the candidate would be awarded 3 marks as they have given three different cultural impacts.

When candidates use recall to ‘go further’ do they get an additional recall point?

It is not required for candidates to add recall when developing source marks. When explaining the quote, the most important thing is that that candidates show understanding of the question asked. They will be awarded a source mark only, no additional knowledge marks.

When was the 2024 paper written – was it before or after changes to the course specifications?

The same level of quality assurance was carried out as in previous years.

Could we have a question on DORA which is no longer in the course descriptor?

The course specification was updated and this involved standardising the number of bullet points across the sections to have greater parity. There was no change to course content.

Can there be a question on culture or society alone?

Yes. They are both valid areas to be asked in the question paper.

Are there any plans to further review the Migration and Empire course content from a decolonisation point of view – more priority given to the ‘darker side’ of Scottish contributions to the Empire than it is currently given?

The negative impact of Scots on the empire and the indigenous people of these countries has always been part of the course. We have ensured that language used is sensitive and appropriate to indigenous people and those affected by Scots during the time of Empire.

What document should teachers use to understand what the course content is?

The course specification was updated and this involved standardising the number of bullet points across the sections to have greater parity. There was no change to course content. This document should still be used.

Is consideration being given by the SQA to adding Higher History to the pilot for requesting papers to be returned? If we could see the papers (preferably for 2024 as well as going forward) we would be able to see where we all went so badly wrong last year.

This is an operational matter.

Would you recommend teaching Migration and Empire (issue two) with a focus on experience, reaction and assimilation or will questions going forward just be on experience?

The course specification was updated and this involved standardising the number of bullet points across the sections to have greater parity. There was no change to course content. This document should still be used.

I would like to ask a question about Thomas Lipton as an example. His name came up in the marking instructions as contributing to the Indian economy through domination of the tea trade. From what I’ve read his influence was in Ceylon/Sri Lanka (although he did use Indian Tamil labourers). I have been using him in class and was wondering if anyone had raised this as an issue?

Thomas Lipton is the son of Irish immigrants. He is a valid example.

Also, would candidates be able to use his name in more than one section, ie impact on Empire on Scotland, Impact of Empire on Scots, and Experiences of Immigrants as long as it was applicable and explained well?

Yes, as long as explained well and the candidate answer links to the question asked.