



Questions & Answers

National 5 History webinar

1 Question paper

'How fully ...' question

Do you need to quote whole sentence in 'How fully ...'? Will they lose mark if they don't close speech marks?

It is possible for a candidate to quote the relevant parts of a sentence and be credited accordingly. However, especially in exam conditions, this can lead to some candidates choosing the parts of the sentence which do not evidence their interpretation of the source point. Most candidates would be advised to use the full sentence as the thinking time required to shorten a sentence makes doing so a marginal gain.

Can we advise candidates they don't have to write out the quotes in 'How fully ...' – they just have to analyse in their own words?

It is possible for candidates to either 'quote and explain' or paraphrase in order to demonstrate the skill of interpreting source points in the 'How fully ...' question. These are the two main ways in which most candidates demonstrate the skill required. Both methods have equal merit.

Could you give some guidance on the difference in marking between 'How fully ...' (Describe) and 'How fully ...' (Explain) questions please.

How fully (describe): the source will contain a description of a historical issue/ event and the expected recalled knowledge would also be descriptions of a historical issue/ event.

How fully (explain): the source will contain reasons for a historical issue/ event and the expected recalled knowledge would also be reasons for a historical issue/ event.

There is no difference between how the two question stems are marked other than in one question you are looking for relevant reasons from the source and recall, and in the other, for relevant historical facts from the source and recall.

Is it beneficial for candidates to repeat wording of the question in describe questions?

It is not an expectation that candidates repeat the wording of the question in the describe question. However, some candidates find that it helps them focus on providing recall points relevant to the question.

Can we advise candidates they don't have to write out the quotes in 'How fully ...' – they just have to analyse in their own words?

Yes, a candidate will achieve a mark if they only interpret the source in their own words. We have simply exemplified for you the two main ways in which candidates approach this question type that would be credited with marks. The best approach for your candidates to choose will vary, often depending on their literacy skills.

Can candidates get 4 out of 6 marks for the 'How fully ...' question if they do not use the source at all; many of my candidates are finding the interpretation very difficult.

As per the general marking instructions, if a candidate makes the required judgement on the question asked, they can attain 4 out of 6 marks for recalled knowledge. However, as the general marking instructions make clear: 'Candidates must make a judgement about the extent to which the source provides a full description/explanation of a given event or development.' To ignore the source entirely therefore, would be counter intuitive as candidates are being rewarded for demonstrating the skill of source analysis and providing contextual knowledge relevant to the source.

9-mark essay

In the 9 marker, if a candidate gets to the end of their first factor and, in the same paragraph states, 'however, there was also (factor B) which was important ...', do they still get the 'alternative' mark, or does it have to come at the start of the paragraph on the second factor?

Candidates are awarded a balance mark not simply for citing another factor but for supplying valid historical evidence in support of that factor. Therefore, the balance mark would not be awarded in the scenario stated unless there was supporting historical evidence.

Can candidates be awarded a Knowledge and Understanding (KU) point in the 9-mark question for just giving a fact about the issue, or does it need to be explained and linked back to the question?

As per the general marking instructions indicate: 'Up to 5 marks can be awarded for relevant, factual, key points of knowledge used to support factors, with 1 mark awarded for each point. If only one factor is presented, a maximum of 3 marks should be awarded for relevant points of knowledge.' Therefore, knowledge must be explained in relation to the question. As per the advice in the webinar, candidates demonstrating the skill of essay writing often make use of signpost sentences at the beginning of each paragraph to ensure that knowledge points are linked to the question.

When awarding a balance mark, would you not also award a KU mark?

A balance mark is awarded when a candidate supplies valid historical evidence in support of a second factor. At this point, both a balance mark and a knowledge mark would be awarded but the candidate is being credited for two separate actions.

In terms of explaining why the most important factor is the most important in the essay conclusion, can the candidate use new information?

A candidate will be credited for any relevant reason supplied in support on their overall judgement.

Can the limitation/however comment be about any factor in the 9-mark essay or does it have to be about the named factor?

There is no mark awarded specifically for historical evidence in support of a limitation comment in the 9-mark essay. However, were a candidate to make such a relevant comment, this would be credited accordingly.

In a 9-mark question about enslaved Africans, will they lose marks for saying slave? If a pupil makes reference to the slave trade and not the trade in enslaved African people, then would they lose a mark?

No. However, in line with the highlighted changes made to the course specification document, it is good practice to encourage candidates to use respectful and appropriate language when referring to people in the past.

‘Evaluate the usefulness’ question

Just to clarify – in a usefulness question – ‘expert in the field’ would be given a mark?

This would be given a mark.

On the evaluate question can you get a mark for quoting and saying that makes the source useful as it is accurate?

As per the detailed market instructions, this would be given a mark. However, candidates are encouraged to link this evaluative comment to the specific source.

Will the marking scheme change this session so pupils that put generic evaluative comments in lose marks?

The marking scheme will not change this session. As per the commentary in the webinar, candidates should make evaluative comments on the specific source. The general marking instructions say: ‘For a mark to be awarded, the candidate must identify an aspect of the source and make a comment which shows why this aspect makes the source more or less useful.’

Would a candidate gain a mark if they quote correctly from the source followed by ‘this is useful as it matches my own knowledge of the subject’?

This is an attempt at an evaluative comment. However, it would not receive a mark because ‘my own knowledge’ is not an objective criterion that enables the candidate to demonstrate why a source is more or less useful.

Will candidates get a mark by saying a historian is useful as they have an expert opinion or must they advance this and refer to the focus of the question?

A candidate would get a mark for evaluating the authorship of a source by commenting on the expert opinion of a historian. However, as commentary in the webinar indicated: it is good practice to make specific comment on the source being analysed.

2 Assignment

Would headers/footers that include the candidate's name be included in the word limit? I add this in when printing out for student so I know who they belong to.

If the header/footer only contained a candidate's name, this information would not be relevant to the word count for the resource sheet.

Can you give an example of a strong or approved title question?

Examples are contained in the webinar. Candidates generally perform at their best when choosing issue-based questions with an isolated factor. Other possible questions include assessment of the success of the Liberal or Labour welfare reforms.

Can the limitation/however comment be about any factor in the 9-mark essay (assignment) or does it have to be about the named factor?

The limitation comment can be made in any of the candidate's chosen paragraph factors.

For evaluation comments in the assignment, must the comment be new information?

To gain an evaluation mark, a candidate should prioritise the paragraph factor (this means assessing the relative importance of the paragraph factor in relation to the others used by the candidate) supported by historical evidence. This evidence should not be a straightforward repetition of previously cited evidence but can be further explanation or new historical evidence. Examples of what valid evaluative comments could look like can be found in webinar and in appendix 1 of the Course Specification document.

In a conclusion section of the assignment in order to get 3 marks does the pupil have to 1) make a decision on which factor was the most important 2) back this up with a reason why and then 3) state all other factors and give them a value against the most important reason, ie Although women's war work was the most important reason, there were other factors such as Suffragists which were LESS important overall.

To achieve 3 marks for the conclusion, a candidate should give an overall judgement on the most important factor (1 mark); supply a supporting reason clearly related to the evidence presented (1 mark); make a relative conclusion on at least one other factor, which should be supported by historical evidence (1 mark).

Does there need to be any supporting reason (SR) for the lesser importance factors [in the conclusion]? Or could they be listed and say they're of lesser importance?

A candidate should give a relative conclusion on at least one other factor, which should be supported by historical evidence. An able candidate may go beyond this, which would be good progression for Higher History.

For prioritisation, if candidates use 'less important' in signposting their evaluation, do they need to refer to their most important, even just through acknowledgement? For example in the Emmett Till example, had the candidate not mentioned MLK, would it have got the mark? Prioritisation is clear for 'most' and 'least', but would simply saying 'less' for the middle factor indicate prioritisation alone?

Much would depend on how the candidate has expressed themselves. For clarity, it would be good practise for the candidate to signpost the meaning of their evaluative comments by referencing the most important factor. If a candidate simply uses the phrase 'less important', it is possible (depending on what the candidate has written) for the marker to consider that the candidate has been insufficiently clear.

If a candidate uses a quote to back up a point of evaluation, will they get an evaluation mark and a reference mark?

Much would depend on the nature of the reference cited and the quality of the analysis in the evaluative comment. If a candidate makes only a brief evaluative comment, then it is unlikely that 2 marks would be awarded.

Evaluation in the assignment: Do the supporting reasons need to be additional to the points already offered in the paragraph? Am I correct in understanding that candidates do not need to offer a negative argument to justify their relative judgements?

To gain an evaluation mark, a candidate should prioritise the paragraph factor (this means assessing the relative importance of the paragraph factor in relation to the others used by the candidate) supported by historical evidence. This evidence should not be a straightforward repetition of previously cited evidence but can be further explanation or new historical evidence.

Candidates will be credited when they meet the threshold for awarding marks as indicated. There is no prescription on whether the historical justification used by a candidate should be negative or positive.

On the resource sheet can candidates put pictures (drawings) and can they put the question on the resource sheet

Candidates should not use pictures in their resource sheets. The candidate is otherwise free to use their resource sheet as they wish, however, all content relevant to the assignment contained in the resource sheet will count towards the word limit.

Are we still unable to give any written feedback on their draft?

The nature of the 'reasonable assistance' which teachers are able to offer their candidates is a decision for teachers themselves and their centres. SQA advice on appropriate reasonable assistance can be found in the Course Specification document. This gives the following advice:

At any stage, reasonable assistance does not include:

- ◆ providing the question, topic or issue
- ◆ directing candidates to specific resources to be used

- ◆ providing model answers or writing frames specific to the task (such as outlines, paragraph headings or section headings)
- ◆ providing detailed feedback on drafts, including marking

If candidates say ‘according to BBC Bitesize ...’ and then go into their quote will they be credited if they have the full URL on their resource sheets?

Yes.

Does the question count towards the word count for the resource sheet?

If the candidate writes the question in the resource sheet, then it would count towards their word limit.

So, a relative judgement in the conclusion needs to have a supporting reason (SR) with it; they cannot be listed as of lesser importance, or can they state 2nd was quite and final was least (without a SR)?

A candidate should support the relative conclusion comment with historical evidence, however brief as the candidate attains this mark for making a qualitative judgement about the question or issue they set themselves. Most candidates who are awarded this mark are adept at supporting their judgements by giving historical reasons.