

2006 History

Advanced Higher – Examination Scripts

Finalised Marking Instructions

© The Scottish Qualifications Authority 2006

The information in this publication may be reproduced to support SQA qualifications only on a non-commercial basis. If it is to be used for any other purposes written permission must be obtained from the Assessment Materials Team, Dalkeith.

Where the publication includes materials from sources other than SQA (secondary copyright), this material should only be reproduced for the purposes of examination or assessment. If it needs to be reproduced for any other purpose it is the centre's responsibility to obtain the necessary copyright clearance. SQA's Assessment Materials Team at Dalkeith may be able to direct you to the secondary sources.

These Marking Instructions have been prepared by Examination Teams for use by SQA Appointed Markers when marking External Course Assessments. This publication must not be reproduced for commercial or trade purposes.

General Instructions

These instructions should be used in conjunction with 'General Instructions to Markers Central Marking 2006' (Publication Code BA 2604).

Markers are particularly asked to note the following points:

- SQA encourages positive marking. Markers should look to reward what the candidate has written, rather than penalise what the candidate has not
- the full range of marks is available to candidates. Award full marks to a response which is as good as can reasonably be expected from a candidate at this stage
- markers are reminded that they must not write comments on scripts. Markers can put the code letters in the margins (I, P, WCD, H etc) to show how they have awarded marks
- markers should write comments as fully as they can in the appropriate spaces on the Ex supplement of each candidate
- markers must be consistent. It is vital that a marker marks to the same standard throughout the diet.

All markers will have their marking reviewed on an ongoing basis during the Central Marking diet. Scripts will be selected at random from each marker's allocation. These will be reviewed by the Examining team. By doing this 'marker check' procedure, the Examining team guarantees the equality of the marking standard across the 12 fields, and ensures that, for example an A in *Renaissance* is the same value as an A in *Britain at War*. Until scripts/markers have been standardised, marks awarded should be regarded as provisional, and written in pencil on Ex Supplements and/or scripts.

In all cases, personal and confidential feedback from the Principal Assessor and the Examining team will be available to markers, and markers will be able to adjust their standard appropriately.

Marking should not commence until after the final briefing by the Principal Assessor and your team leader.

You should not mark papers from your own centre. If a packet contains scripts of a candidate you know or who is from a centre in which you have an interest (whether this has been previously declared or not), pass the packet to another marker.

Open each envelope and:

Check the particulars in the grid of the Mark Sheet against those on the envelope label.

Check that the candidates whose scripts are enclosed are those whose names are listed on the Mark Sheet.

Marking Part 1: The essays

To obtain a pass, there **must** be some reference to historiography, even be it ever so humble. If the candidate is unable to show that they have referred to or quoted from historians, or considered historical schools of thought, then they are not meeting the basic requirements of the marks scheme for a pass. Full guidance on the intention of each essay, and possible format and relevant content of candidates' answers is given in the detailed marking instructions for each field.

The set of **generic criteria** for each grade level follows, and markers must carefully consider the overall merits of each essay against that list.

The following descriptions provide guidance on the features of essays categorised as meriting the ranking D, C, B, A, A+ and A++. Many essays will exhibit some but not all of the features listed, others will be stronger in one area than another. Features of a C essay may well appear in an essay which overall merits a B or A pass. **With the exception of 'Historical interpretations', the criteria should NOT be thought of as hurdles, all of which must be crossed before a grade boundary is reached.** Markers should reward what the candidate has tried to argue rather than penalise what may have been omitted. Remember, a candidate's arguments and evidence may differ substantially from the marks scheme, but the candidate should still be given whatever credit they deserve.

D 10-12 marks

Candidates may show that they have little understanding of what the question is really asking them to do, or then show little more than a basic knowledge and understanding of the main features of the issue.

The structure may be weak with a disorganised presentation of the arguments.

The answer will be more narrative and description rather than analysis.

It may be very brief and arguments will look thin, un-sustained and possibly inaccurate or irrelevant.

There will be no references to the interpretations of historians, or even recognition that their study has shaped our thinking on the issues.

The introduction and conclusion may acknowledge the question, but without development.

C 13-14 marks

A structure that may be loose but will probably include an introduction and a conclusion.

A basic attempt has been made to answer the question by providing appropriate arguments, and supporting those arguments with relevant factual knowledge; possibly not deep or sustained.

Some reference to historical interpretations can be seen; it may be fairly formulaic or 'bolted on'.

Reasonable clarity and accuracy.

B 15-17 marks

It is probable that some essays will achieve the B-grade mark because they are of A-grade quality in one or two ways but fall short of it in others.

The argument will be structured coherently and will come to a suitable conclusion.

There will be an impression of thoroughness; the candidate shows a grasp of the aims of the question and tackles it with a fairly sustained analysis.

The approach will be relevant though there may be some irrelevant paragraphs.

There will be an awareness of historians' work and some of their views on this issue.

There will be a good degree of clarity and accuracy.

A 18-19 marks

Clearly structured.

A thorough piece of work based on a fair quantity of relevant factual evidence.

The candidate has an assured and consistent control of the arguments and issues, and sees most of the implications of the question and tackles them relevantly.

Contains some detailed analysis of relevant issues.

Shows an awareness of historians' work and arguments, in some cases this permeates the answer.

Written clearly with a vocabulary appropriate to the topic.

It has a conclusion that arises logically from the evidence and arguments in the main body of the essay.

A+ 20-22 marks

A well defined structure displaying a very confident grasp of the demands of the question.

A very thorough piece of work based on wide research.

The candidate has a very assured and consistent control of all the arguments and issues, and provides a focussed approach to the question.

Shows a sound knowledge and understanding of historians' work and arguments.

The conclusion gives a robust overview/synthesis and a qualitative judgement of factors.

A++ 23+ marks

Notably thorough and clearly based on a wide range of accurately explained factual information.

Thinks about various possible implications of the question, going beyond the most obvious ones.

Structured so that the argument convincingly builds and develops through the essay.

Uses detailed analysis effectively to advance the argument.

Engages with current historiography, which may be wide-ranging and often permeates the answer.

Written with fluency, sophistication and clarity.

Further general advice to markers – Essays

Even though all markers will mark positively and reward what is there in the essay, they may still ask themselves if there are any criteria where, if it has not been met, the candidate **must** fail.

Factors which do lead to an essay failing:

1. **Total misunderstanding of the title.** The essay is set as a particular title, and therefore there is a particular issue to be addressed. An essay where the candidate has missed completely the point of the question is almost certain to fail.

Similarly, a candidate may seem to ‘turn’ a question to fit a prepared response. While some aspects may be able to be credited, the marker must be convinced that the response adequately and actively addresses the question set for a pass to be awarded.

In a question which contains an isolated factor, this factor must receive due attention. A response which ignores the isolated factor must fail.

2. **Extreme brevity.** A very short essay of around only 2-3 sides would have to be astonishingly well argued to get a pass. It is highly unlikely that there will be sufficient depth and breadth of argument to convince a marker it had covered enough of the markable criteria to pass.
3. **Lack of historiography.** The need for historiography in essays is clearly set out in the Grade Descriptions in the Course Arrangements. Essays without recognition of different historical interpretations **must therefore fail**. There is a fairly open definition of ‘historical interpretations’ as the minimum expected pass standard. What is expected at Advanced Higher level is that **there are signs of the candidates’ reading, and therefore some awareness that there are different views on an issue.**

If a candidate were to introduce a new paragraph with a phrase such as ‘Naturally, other historians have argued ...’ or ‘There is another school of thought on this matter ...’ that will suffice for meeting the C standard. If they start (accurately) quoting historians by name or refer to particular schools of thought, or give quotes from historians and changing views over time, that clearly takes the essay into B and A territory on this aspect of the marking.

Factors which are NOT in themselves fatal to the candidates chances:

1. **Structure.** This may be poor and the candidate rambles their way through their piece. However, it may still be that enough other insightful and relevant aspects are explored in enough depth to persuade the marker that the candidate should be awarded a pass at some level. A sense of structure often ‘appears’ during the essay so a candidate shouldn’t be penalised or down-graded just because nothing much seems to have been laid out in the introduction.
2. **Accuracy.** Several minor inaccuracies, or indeed, a few fairly major ones, will not in themselves be sufficient to fail a response. It may be that the marker becomes increasingly convinced that the candidate is not in full control of their evidence, and that may deter the granting of an A pass, but it does not automatically lead to a fail.
3. **Relevance.** While relevance is important, it is not the sole criterion on which a response is judged. It is a question of degree; responses should be marked positively. A pass at the C level can be gained by an essay with enough relevance to convince the marker of its overall virtue; an A pass can be granted even despite the odd lapse or digression.

4. **Thoroughness.** This aspect of width of detail is a clearly a major discriminating factor in determining a grade. It is NOT a pass-fail factor. If a candidate misses out what a marker thinks is a key factor, but comprehensively discusses a lot of other key factors, the A pass can still be awarded. While the candidate may seem to be presenting a very ill-balanced and distorted view of the width of relevant issues in the chosen title, that selectivity is the candidate's privilege. Therefore the marker should mark the essay for what argument it does contain and not for the degree to which it conforms to the view of the marker.

Equally, in terms of depth of detail, many essays are a very good review, albeit sometimes superficial, of a lot of the issues that are relevant. Candidates who follow this approach, which may appear light on analysis or evidence, may still have done enough to merit a pass or even slightly more.

5. **Use of language.** Candidates' linguistic skills vary. Essays can often be clumsily expressed in fairly poor English, but still contain many of the admirable criteria that merit high reward. Equally, there can be fluent and stylish pieces that flatter to deceive when the marker gets beyond the language and studies the other criteria.
6. **Conclusion.** This is an important aspect of the essay; it pulls it all together and shows the marker how the candidate has marshalled their facts and arguments. A good conclusion is often decisive in pulling the essay into the next higher marks band, and a weak conclusion will certainly hinder the chances of getting an A. However, the lack of a conclusion in itself is not a factor leading to an automatic fail.

Marking Part 2: The source questions

The examination paper now has 3 standardised stems on the source questions.

The ‘how fully’ question (12 marks)

The candidate should establish the view of the source and interpret what that view is, with an opportunity to earn up to 3 marks by discriminatory thinking about which points of the source are relevant to the question. If they select these points, by either quoting them, paraphrasing them or referring to them, then they must be given credit.

The candidate can then earn the remaining marks by the quality and depth of the immediate and/or wider contextual recall that they provide in their overall interpretation of the source’s comprehensiveness.

There is no mandatory provenance comment for this question. Therefore there is no allocation of marks put against it. However, candidates may still make some perfectly relevant and appropriate provenance comments which help locate it within its historical context or help define the background and/or authorship of the writer in a way that genuinely helps answer the set question. That should be rewarded but it has to be something more precise and focused than the candidate offering a formulaic ‘the value of a secondary source is a modern interpretation etc ...’. Contextualised provenance comment is given credit under the ‘historiography’ marks that are awarded. This style of marking should be encouraged.

The ‘how useful’ question (12 marks)

The candidate may be awarded up to 3 marks for the quality of their evaluation of the provenance of the source. Candidates may offer this in slightly formulaic form at the lowest level but that will not necessarily merit the full 3 marks.

The candidate can then earn marks (as in the ‘how fully’ question above), for establishing the view, interpreting the sources and accurately supporting that evaluation with comment from the source.

A combination of provenance comment and interpretation can earn up to a maximum of 5 marks. The candidate can earn the remaining marks from the quality and depth of the immediate and/or wider contextual recall provided in the overall interpretation of the source’s value. Markers will award marks particularly in the upper ranges for historiographical issues that the candidate raises.

The ‘two-source’ question (16 marks)

Candidates should apply the same techniques to the ‘two-source’ question, as they do to the other two.

One of the two sources may be a primary source. It is likely that the candidate will include provenance comment. This should be rewarded in the same way as if the candidate has answered the question as a single-source ‘how useful’ question. Marking of both sources will give the candidate a chance to earn ‘interpretation’ marks as in the section above.

The candidate can therefore possibly earn as many as 7 marks out of the 16 before earning the marks that come from providing the wider contextual recall which will help to complete the process that is demanded by the question, (this always asks them to consider the views in the two sources and weigh up their merits against each other and a range of possible other views that may be supportable.)

Marking Scripts and Recording Marks

1. In everything that you record on a script, make your intentions absolutely clear for the benefit of SQA staff and any others who may refer to the script later.
2. Mark and value every answer and enter the marks awarded in red, at the end of the answer in the right margin, as indicated in the Detailed Marking Instructions. Occasionally a candidate may skip one or two pages in the script by mistake and proceed to answer questions further on in the script. You should be satisfied that in each case all the answers have been marked.
3. Where supplementary items are enclosed inside answer books, indicate clearly, on each item, that it has been considered and include any marks awarded in the answer book against the candidate's answer to the same/related question.
4. If the paper is one on which options are given, ensure that the candidate does not receive credit for answering more than the prescribed number of questions. If the prescribed number has been exceeded, mark all of the answers and select for inclusion in the total the highest marks gained by the candidate consistent with the rubrics of the paper. **Cross through the answers which are not included in the total.** Draw attention on the outside of the script, **not on the Mark Sheet**, to the fact that the candidate has exceeded the prescribed number of questions. If a candidate answers more than one of the options in a question, cross out the option which gains the lower mark and exclude this from the total.
5. If you refer a candidate's script to the Principal Assessor, put a brief explanation in the "For Official Use" section on the front cover of the script concerned. You should pass such packets to the Principal Assessor for further action.
6. The total mark for a paper should be entered in the Total box on the front cover of the answer book. (The total mark must be given as a whole number). Markers must check their additions carefully, by summing marks from the first to the last page of the script and then from the last to the first page. The transcription of marks, within booklets and to the Mark Sheets, should also be checked.

It is helpful to the Examining team if all markers of the scripts write something like the marks breakdown illustrated below, on the outside **BACK** page of the candidate's answer booklet, to show how they have assembled their overall mark. This makes it easier to check that the addition is correct.

EXAMPLE

Essay 3	16	
Essay 5	14	
		—
		30
Source Q1	8	
Source Q2	6	
Source Q3	13	
		—
Total	27	
		—
Total	57	

It is vitally important that marks should be entered accurately on the mark sheet(s). The final mark for the question paper should be entered as above.

Ex Supplement

To assist standardisation and to inform decisions on any appeals, markers should complete an Ex Supplement for each candidate. Brief comments explaining marking decisions are most helpful to examiners.

Comments should not be written on the candidate's answer booklet.

A supply of Ex Supplements will be available in the central marking venue. They should be handed in to SQA administrative staff along with the final envelopes of marked scripts.

Special Assessment Arrangements

Transcriptions

You may have been allocated scripts where a candidate has been given permission to have his/her script transcribed. You should mark the candidate's original work and refer only to the transcription where necessary. Diagrammatical material should not be transcribed. If this has been done the transcribed diagrams should be disregarded.

All marks should be shown on the candidate's scripts and the packet should be processed in the normal way.

Suspected Malpractice

Some candidates' responses may contain similarities which suggest that there may have been copying. If it appears that this is likely to be the result of the teaching method by which the candidates have been prepared for the examination, there is no need for attention to be drawn to the case.

If however, 2 or more scripts contain the same errors, or other similarities which suggest possible malpractice, a short report with the relevant details should be prepared on a separate sheet of paper. All scripts, including the suspect scripts, should then be marked in the normal way. Please involve the Principal Assessor and team leader for a discussion of suspect scripts.

Marker Report

This is an important mechanism in our procedures for quality assurance. Comments on candidate performance and the workings of the marking scheme contribute towards the Principal Assessor's report. **This report should be completed before leaving the Central Marking venue.**

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]