



Questions and answers

Higher History: question paper 2 webinar —

25th February 2025

Is it correct that we don't need to say 'useful' to get a mark?

Correct. 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.

Do candidates need to link back to the question?

It is good practice for students to use the words of the question however, there is no requirement.

Is it correct that the recall doesn't have to explicitly say why the source is less useful/evaluative and that the comment just has to say that it omits to mention, and then fill in the blanks with knowledge?

By giving explained recall points that link to the question, then the candidate is stating why the source is less useful (by telling us what it omits).

Regarding Scottish examples/specificity, one of the recall points for the weakness of the Catholic church was quite generic, eg indulgences and not providing a relevant Scottish example, that would make this mark risky when being marked by someone who doesn't teach it. Can you clarify this?

Regarding indulgences, the marking instructions include this point and so a non-specialist marker would have awarded the mark.

Can pupils rephrase the quotes, using many of the same words, and still get the mark, or does it have to be developed further?

Yes. When explaining the quote, the most important thing is that candidates show understanding of the question asked.

Is it correct that all recall points must be related to the factors mentioned in the question? For example, if the question was ‘How much do sources A and B reveal about the relations between native Scots and Irish immigrants’, all recall points must be related to the relations between Scots and Irish?

In a two-source question, the recall needs to be relevant to the sub-issue.

Do the source content points need to reflect the overview. For example, should they show why the candidate arrived at this interpretation or can it be approached similarly to a ‘how fully’ content point as an event that took place, within context of the question?

The overview is based on the source content points, but there is no need to explicitly link the overall point back to the content points.

Do the candidates have to write out the full quotes they are referring to before they evaluate them?

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.

Does recall need explained or is an example accepted?

There is no limit on how much a candidate should or should not write with regard to recall for any question stem. This most important thing is to ensure that what they have written answers relating to the question asked and have explained them.

If candidates don't make the overall viewpoint mark, but provide four content and six recall points, can they can still be awarded 10/10 marks, or do they need to at least have attempted the overall viewpoint mark?

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)
- ◆ 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) for examples in the 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

Your examples said ‘Another interpretation’ is this practice you'd encourage or can recall points still be something like ‘Something the sources fail to mention is...’

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 an overall interpretation of a source just pick out the key points eg, Source A reflects the resilience of Scots in the Battle of Loos and how they were important in gaining territory?

Using the Loos example – if the overall interpretation of the source is about resilience, that's good, but just repeating the source content points again is not enough to gain the mark(s).

I thought in the ‘explain’ question they had to give a mini case study as well as explaining why the point is relevant. Is this not the case?

Candidates need to give explained points that answer the question, as highlighted in the examples provided during the Understanding Standards presentation.

Is there a cap on marks for answers that don't cover all four bullet points within the issue, or for answers that only address one or two of the bullet points?

No, there is no cap.

Do you see many learners who are penalised for no judgement — do many make that error?

Very rarely. Sometimes candidates do not make a judgment at the start but then go on to say ‘however it does not state all the reason for...’ when bringing in recall. This is also a judgment.

Regarding the points with examples – do the candidates get an additional mark for a developed point or is it still 1 mark?

It is still 1 mark. There are no developed points at higher.

Would the last trade with Holland answer be a good example of the 3-point method you mentioned?

There are a number of ways to do it. I use the 3-point method for 'explain' questions. There are examples here that are two sentences long – there is not a one size fits all response. The most important thing is that candidates answer the question asked.

Would it be possible for the team to just make up minimum answers rather than use candidate answers?

We use candidate evidence as this provides examples of what candidates in Scotland write under exam conditions. We have highlighted through our candidate evidence and 'explain' examples what level is required for Higher History. Candidates must explain points and show understanding.

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 to 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 to do so.

With reference to slide 64 of the presentation, if the candidate had done up to the end of the second sentence, would this have been enough for a mark (just) without the third, or is that link back crucial for the mark to be awarded?

The candidate would still gain a mark without the last sentence in this instance.