



## External Assessment Report 2012

Subject(s)	History
Level(s)	History Standard Grade

The statistics used in this report are pre-appeal.

This report provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers/lecturers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding. It would be helpful to read this report in conjunction with the published question papers and marking instructions for the examination.

# Comments on candidate performance

## General comments

As in previous years, the vast majority of candidates opted for Unit Contexts 1B, 11A and 111D. A sizeable minority selected options 1C and 111C, with a smaller number of candidates choosing options 1A, 11B and 111A. Numbers attempting 111B were minimal.

Marker feedback deemed all three papers (F/G/C) to be challenging but fair, with broad sampling of the main aspects of the syllabus. The papers were considered to be accessible, across all contexts, to the wide range of ability presented at each level.

Similarly, Gaelic-medium scripts did not seem to present candidates with any obvious difficulties. At each level (F/G/C), candidate responses were good. Almost all completed the General paper in Gaelic, but some require a little more confidence to respond entirely in Gaelic at Credit level. It should be noted that the number of Gaelic-medium entries rose this year to 24 at Credit, 28 at General, and four at Foundation.

As in previous years, overall performance varied according to ability, especially at the interfaces, ie good General candidates found the Foundation exam fairly straightforward, whilst genuine Foundation candidates were challenged — a pattern repeated at General and Credit.

Overall ES continues to improve and is almost universally the stronger element at C/G. Clearly, centres are training candidates well in such skills but the widening discrepancy between ES and KU, especially at Credit, is concerning in view of progression to Higher.

Disappointingly, however, despite the significant downward trend noted in 2010 and 2011, following SQA instructions that invigilators and centre PTs/Faculty Heads should liaise and direct candidates to appropriate contexts, markers at all three levels (F/G/C) reported that a fair number of incorrect and/or multiple contexts were attempted this year. There were also renewed instances of candidates attempting KU and ES questions out of sequence and to their detriment (see Advice to Centres).

In addition, markers continue to report increased instances, across F/G/C, of poor and indeed almost illegible handwriting, made worse by use of pencil rather than pen. Many typed scripts also proved problematic to read and mark where no spacing, or single spacing, was used (see Advice to Centres).

## Foundation

Overall performance was deemed to be very positive: candidates continued to be better prepared for the Units studied and demonstrated greater understanding of technique (following instructions, using source evidence and applying process), which was reflected especially at ES. Once again, there were far fewer minimalist or one-word answers, with some very full and expanded answers provided.

However, whilst invigilator/centre direction of candidates to tick appropriate context boxes has proved successful generally, a disappointing number of candidates — and prevalent to certain centres — attempted the wrong or multiple contexts, with many completing every question in Units IA/B/C and failing to start or finish Units IIA/B as a result.

The 2012 Foundation paper, whilst still presenting a worthy challenge, was considered to be well-laid out, accessible and well tackled by candidates, the majority of whom opted for Unit Contexts IB and IIA.

## **General**

Most markers felt that the majority of candidates responded very well to the demands of the General paper. There were a number of poorer scripts, but most candidates seemed to give their best efforts, displaying good process throughout, with many attempting lengthy and expanded answers. However, significant numbers of candidates were giving little or no recall in KU questions, resulting in few candidates with full marks at KU, whereas ES continued to improve and become almost universally the better element, outstripping KU in terms of exam performance.

Clearly, most centres are training candidates well in terms of technique and the need to make process clear in their answers. However, many markers felt that this was at the expense of mastering recall, which was not as strong yet again this year, even from C/G candidates. A significant number omitted the required recall from their answers, which were heavily reliant on presented evidence, both at KU and ES (where required). This disparity or imbalance between KU and ES was considered to indicate a lack of study/revision by candidates who had otherwise been well trained to handle ES with confidence or, indeed, of learning organised under 'preferred headings'.

Worryingly, markers reported a fair number still attempting wrong/multiple contexts, with renewed instances of candidates attempting KU and ES questions out of sequence. This was generally to their detriment, particularly in Unit I where there is a degree of overlap across Contexts A/B/C, as marks for both Sections A and B must be taken from the same context. As a consequence, a fair number of candidates had their KU marks discounted since ES carries heavier weighting overall. Clearly this had an effect on KU marks and grades.

Overall, the 2012 General paper was considered to be very fair and accessible, with good rigour in challenging candidates in terms of recall and process but providing opportunities for candidates to perform well, both in terms of knowledge and skills, if prepared.

## **Credit**

Once again, and as usual with C/G candidates, performance was variable but overall markers considered 2012 scripts to be of a reasonably high standard with few very weak scripts and some really excellent responses. The majority of candidates completed the paper

in the time allocated and the wrong contexts were rarely attempted. However, whilst fewer very poor scripts were noted, concern still remains about inappropriate presentations.

As has been the trend in recent years, the vast majority of markers commented that overall ES continues to improve and, once again, is almost universally the stronger element at C/G. In many cases there is a complete imbalance between the two elements, with ES marks significantly better than those at KU, where relatively few candidates are achieving very high scores by comparison. This was highlighted in the short essay, where generally both process and structure were good, yet candidates struggled with content – and candidates cannot pass the essay question if they don't pass the History.

There was clear evidence that centres are training candidates well in ES skills, but the ever-widening discrepancy between ES and KU, particularly at Credit is concerning – especially for progression to Higher. As noted over the last two years, candidate bias towards ES skills appears to have lessened any encouragement to learn accurate and specific factual information to support potential argument. Markers continue to highlight lack of relevant recall due to either lack of revision or misreading of questions rather than any ambiguity inherent in questions. Answers appear more conditional on what is taught and how it is learned, focusing on preferences and ignoring perceived 'peripheral' syllabus.

Overall, the 2012 Credit paper was considered to be very fair, straightforward and accessible to candidates, the areas covered representing a good cross-section of the course and providing enough opportunities for candidates to demonstrate knowledge and skills.

## **Areas in which candidates performed well**

### **Foundation**

Markers commented positively about overall performance, noting that most candidates responded well to the content of the paper. However, whilst KU questions were generally well addressed, the majority of candidates understanding source content, ES was notably stronger than KU, with the exception of ES6 (ie the conclusion to the Investigation) which remains problematic.

Clearly candidates had been well trained in the different types of ES questions and were performing particularly well at ES1, 2 and 5, where multiple-choice/ layout prompts/tables with relevant page references have proved to be excellent additions in helping candidates to structure their answers and achieve good scores, if they read the question/instructions carefully.

More specifically:

- ◆ in Units IA/B/C, ES1 questions were well done, with ES5 done best in Unit IA.
- ◆ Question 4, ES1: most candidates knew how to select the correct statements to explain why the source was useful.

- ◆ Question 5, ES5: most candidates knew how to select relevant presented evidence to support the appropriate tabular heading.
- ◆ In Unit IIA, ES1 Questions 3 and 6 and Unit IIB, ES1 Questions 1 and 5, were well done on the whole.
- ◆ ES1: most candidates knew how to select the correct statements to explain why the source, whether written or pictorial, was useful.
- ◆ In Unit IIA, ES2 Questions 4 (Agree) and 8 (Disagree) and Unit IIB, ES2 Questions 2 (Agree) and 8 (Disagree), were very well done with far fewer cases of mis-matching than previously.
- ◆ ES2: most candidates knew how to select relevant presented evidence, whether written or pictorial, to support a valid example of agreement or of disagreement. Unit IIA Question 4 was particularly well attempted.
- ◆ In Unit IIA, ES3 Question 7 and Unit IIB, ES3 Question 7, both demonstrated improved candidate performance.
- ◆ ES3: most candidates knew how to select relevant presented evidence to support an attitude as identified in the question.

## **General**

Candidates were generally presented more strongly in ES than KU, with the correct process being carried out in ES questions by the majority of candidates. Some excellent training is apparent, with ES answers continuing to improve as candidates appear to have a better understanding of how to answer each question type. There was also much evidence of good process in KU2 and KU3 question items.

More specifically:

- ◆ In Units IA/B/C, population questions were well done across all contexts.
- ◆ Question 1, KU2: most candidates knew how to select relevant presented evidence to explain why Scotland's population increased. Many were able to add relevant recall to their answers here.
- ◆ In Units IA/B/C, ES1 and ES5 questions were well done, with ES5 almost universally done best of all ES Question types.
- ◆ Question 3, ES1: most candidates knew how to evaluate the source's usefulness, with significantly fewer 'rehearsing a mantra' and even weaker candidates attempting to address not just process and content but also limitation, purpose and contemporaneity. However, some markers were concerned that a number, most likely C/G candidates were over-writing to the detriment of timing.

- ◆ Question 5, ES5: most candidates knew how to select relevant presented evidence to support the appropriate viewpoints in the questions. Once again this elicited best responses overall, most candidates achieving high marks, especially if tables and bullet points were used.

However, full marks were not achieved mainly when candidates provided only minimalist quotes which did not 'stand alone' and a minority still misunderstand the process and effectively pre-empt their conclusion by explaining or expanding quotes and by wrongly including recall in their response.

NB Collectively 'Investigation' (ES1/5/6) questions were completed effectively across all three contexts, with most candidates picking up a lot of marks here – again demonstrating good practice by centres and candidates. Excellent training has resulted in by far the majority of candidates carrying out the correct process.

- ◆ In Units IIA/B, ES2 Question 4 (Agree) and in Units IIIA/B/C/D, ES2 Question 4 (Disagree), showed significant improvement and were very well done by most candidates across all contexts. Once again markers noted far more evidence of developed comparisons and well-taught technique.
- ◆ ES2: most candidates knew how to select relevant presented evidence, whether written or pictorial, to support a valid example of agreement or of disagreement.
- ◆ In Units IIA/B, ES4 Question 5 (How fully?), again showed a degree of improvement but there were issues, highlighted later, with candidates not addressing the actual question being asked.
- ◆ ES4: most candidates knew how to select relevant presented evidence to support their answer.
- ◆ In Unit IIIA, KU3 and KU2 ,Questions 1 and 2 respectively, were well attempted by candidates.
- ◆ KU3 and 2: most candidates knew how to address the correct process and to select relevant presented evidence to support their answer, many were able to add relevant recall to their answers here.
- ◆ In Units IIIA/B/C/D, ES3 Question 3 (Attitude), showed improvement with some markers highlighting better training in technique.
- ◆ ES3: most candidates knew how to achieve a holistic mark, with many gaining another by using evidence in support of this.

### **Credit**

As ever, responses were of a variable quality but overall most candidates performed competently, with some very high quality answers and, in some cases, many extra booklets

enclosed for marking. Again, the issue appears to be with KU: whilst generally good at addressing process in KU questions, a lot of well-trained and able candidates are scoring considerably less at KU than at ES. As such candidates need to answer questions as set and not as pre-prepared.

Overall, candidates addressed process well in KU1, 2 and 3 questions, and very well in ES2,4 and 5 questions.

More specifically:

- ◆ In Units IA/B/C, KU1 questions were done well across all contexts.
- ◆ Question 1, KU1: most candidates knew how to describe the dangers/changes in working conditions, with detailed recalled knowledge demonstrated particularly in IB.
- ◆ In Units IA/B/C, ES1 (to an extent) and ES5 questions were very well attempted, with ES5 almost universally done best of all ES question types.
- ◆ Question 3, ES1: most candidates knew how to evaluate the source's usefulness, with significantly fewer 'rehearsing a mantra' and even weaker candidates attempting to address not just process and content but also limitation, purpose and contemporaneity. However, few achieved full marks and markers were concerned that a significant number had difficulty with a secondary source.
- ◆ Question 5, ES5: most candidates knew how to select relevant presented evidence to support the appropriate viewpoints in the questions. However, some candidates struggled to link very minimalist quotes to the issue/headings as these failed to 'stand alone' as answers.

Once again this elicited best responses overall, most candidates achieving high marks, especially if tables and bullet points were used.

However, full marks were not achieved mainly when candidates provided only minimalist quotes which did not 'stand alone' and a minority still misunderstand the process and effectively pre-empt their conclusion by explaining or expanding quotes and by wrongly including recall in their response.

NB, Collectively 'Investigation' (ES1/5/6) questions were completed effectively across all three contexts, with most candidates picking up a lot of marks here — again demonstrating good practice by centres and candidates. Excellent training has resulted in by far the majority of candidates carrying out the correct process.

- ◆ In Units IIA/B, ES2 Question 4 (Disagree) and in Units IIIA/B/C/D, ES2 Question 3 (Agree), were well done by most candidates across all contexts. Once again markers noted far more evidence of developed comparisons and well-taught technique.

- ◆ ES2: most candidates knew how to select relevant presented evidence, whether written or pictorial, to support a valid example of agreement or of disagreement. However, there were issues, highlighted later, with the pictorial source in Unit IIA.
- ◆ In Units IIA/B, ES4 Question 5 (How fully?), again showed a degree of improvement on previous years.
- ◆ ES4: most candidates knew how to select relevant presented evidence to support their answer. However, some candidates struggled to include accurate and relevant recall.
- ◆ In Units IIIA/B/C/D, KU3 Question 1 (Short Essay), showed continued improvement across all contexts in terms of process and structure, with some markers highlighting better training in technique. However, essays were best attempted in Unit IIIA, with a significant number of candidates achieving full marks. Issues with IIIC and IIID will be highlighted later.
- ◆ Unit IIIA, Question 1, KU1: most candidates knew how to write a short essay of several paragraphs, including an introduction and conclusion, which assessed the importance of the isolated factor(s).
- ◆ In Units IIIA/B/C/D, ES2 Question 2 (Attitude), showed continued improvement across all contexts, with some markers highlighting better training in technique.
- ◆ ES3: most candidates knew how to achieve a holistic mark, with many gaining another by using evidence in support of this. However, few achieved full marks in this question.

## **Areas which candidates found demanding**

### **Foundation KU**

- ◆ Unit 1A/B/C, KU3: there were two issues here, particularly in IB ie
  - (a) Surprisingly, the use of scrolls/poster format seemed to confuse many candidates who included the distracter in their answers.
  - (b) Others misunderstood the question, ie ‘Why was the 1833 Factory Act/1842 Mines Act/1970&1975 Government Acts important in improving working conditions for children/women?’ For a significant number, the question proved challenging in terms of process and recall, many merely describing working conditions before the Acts or explaining the need for reform, rather than demonstrating why the particular acts were important. Essentially candidates misread or misunderstood the question, treating the KU3 instead as either a KU1 or as a KU2.

### **Foundation ES**

- ◆ Units IA/B/C, but especially IB/C ‘The Suffragette Campaign’. The ES5 table was poorly attempted by a significant number of candidates for whom the selection of presented evidence was often very minimalist, thus failing to meet the criterion of ‘stand alone’

quotes, and/or for others who tended to describe Suffragette actions rather than linking in to how this won/lost support, as required by the question.

- ◆ Unit IA/B/C and again especially IB/C 'The Suffragette Campaign'. The ES6 item (Conclusion) continues to challenge and was generally poorly done. Indeed the ES6 was either not attempted or rarely achieved 2/2: most candidates who did get marks for this question gave a holistic answer worth only 1/2 marks. Many candidates remain uncertain by what actually is required for a conclusion: very few made reference to either presented evidence, already gleaned from the sources or table of answers in the preceding ES5, or recall in order to support conclusions which were often no more than personal/uninformed opinions.

### General KU

- ◆ Units 1A/B/C, KU1 Question 2 ('Describe the new technology that improved farming/railways/shipbuilding...'). These technology questions were poorly done across all contexts, with recall particularly weak for shipbuilding in IC, but also patchy for railways in IB.
- ◆ Unit IIA, KU3 Question 1 (assess importance of alliances in outbreak of war): candidates found this difficult and again displayed a lack of relevant recall in their answers. Many appeared unaware that they could refer to 'other factors' and resorted to what markers called 'story-telling', essentially descriptive narrative, misreading the question and muddling KU1/3 technique.
- ◆ Unit IIA, KU1 question 2 ('Describe military terms of Treaty of Versailles'): surprisingly very poorly done, with many again misreading the question to discuss terms in general rather than focusing on the **military** terms as required.
- ◆ Unit IIIC, KU3 Question 2 (War Communism); IIID, KU3 Question 2 (Weimar elections) and IIID, KU2 (Spartacists), all proved difficult for a significant number of candidates in terms of recall, and were poorly attempted. Again, many appeared unaware that they could refer to 'other factors' in the KU3.

NB Markers commented that question wording seemed fair and straight-forward, with good rigour. Lack of relevant recall appeared due to either lack of revision or misreading of questions rather than of any ambiguity inherent in questions. Once again, KU answers appear more conditional on what is taught and how it is learned, focusing on preferences and ignoring what is perceived as peripheral syllabus.

### General ES

Units IA/B/C, ES5 questions, although almost universally done best out of all ES Question types, carry this caveat as noted above: full marks were not achieved mainly when candidates provided only minimalist quotes which did not 'stand alone' and a minority still misunderstand the process and effectively pre-empt their conclusion by explaining or expanding quotes and by wrongly including recall in their response.

- ◆ Units IA/B/C, ES6 questions were not well done generally. Responses suffered from the fact that, whilst ES skills are well developed, candidates – C/G and G/F-exhibited little recall/ understanding of context where this is required. As such, across the contexts, ES6 proved the weakest skill since lack of recall automatically results in the potential mark of 4 reducing to 2 maximum.
- ◆ Units IIA/B, ES1 Question 3 (How useful?) and ES2 Question 4 (Comparing): in both these 'linked' questions, candidates found the visuals challenging, especially where the photograph/poster allowed subjective interpretations as to what these actually showed in terms of identifiable 'agreements' and/or 'disagreements'.
- ◆ Units IIA/B, ES4 Question 5 (How fully..?):Again, technology questions were not done well, the key problem here being that candidates misinterpreted the question, describing or just naming (new) technology eg tanks or gas rather than describing/exemplifying the use of new technology as required . In addition there was a general lack of recall, as noted above in ES6.
- ◆ Unit IIIB, ES3 Question 3 (Attitude) appeared more difficult than IIIA/C/D for the few candidates who attempted this context.

### Credit KU

- ◆ Units I A/B/C, KU 2 (Public Health): generally candidates struggled with 'public health' but, more specifically, in IB/C became confused, widely misinterpreting the question as **why** public health **had to improve**, as in IA, rather than **why it had improved** as actually worded in IB/C.
- ◆ Unit IIA, KU2 (Naval Arms Race) and Unit II A/B, KU1 (League of Nations/United Nations): were both poorly answered, lacking process in KU2, **describing** than **explaining**, and lacking relevant recall generally, eg lots of candidates discussed terms of Treaty of Versailles in aims of League.
- ◆ Unit III A/B/C/D, KU3 Essays: overall were very disappointing, apart from IIIA where both essay choices were well done and IIIC where 1(b) (Purges) was also done better than IIID generally. In the latter, many wrote about Hitler's rise to power/the Nazi Party **pre-1933** rather than the Nazi Government in power **post-1933**.

Markers commented at length on the lack of relevant recall, the amount of narrative, and failure to link potential supporting evidence to the question being asked. Again, lack of relevant recall appeared due to either lack of revision or misreading of questions rather than of any ambiguity inherent in questions.

### Credit ES

- ◆ Units I A/B/C, ES1 (How useful?): here reference to secondary sources and authorship still presents difficulties for many candidates, who don't seem to appreciate the usefulness of historians! Some markers also remarked on the length of answers, with much over-writing of irrelevant detail.

- ◆ Units I B/C, ES5 (Selecting and Recording): minimalist/'stand alone' quotes proved tougher than in IA, where the candidate failed to make a link to the question/heading as required.
- ◆ Units IA/B/C, ES6 questions generally were not done well. Responses suffered from the fact that many candidates failed to include all three elements of presented evidence, recall and balance as required. As such, across the contexts, ES6 proved the weakest skill since lack of recall/balance (the most commonly omitted) automatically results in the potential mark of 5 reducing to 2 maximum.
- ◆ Units II A/B, ES1 question 3 (How useful?): many candidates struggled with the source in pictorial format as well as the nature of propaganda and also ES2 question 4 (Comparing): in both these 'linked' questions, candidates found the visuals challenging, especially where the posters allowed subjective interpretations as to what these actually showed in terms of identifiable 'agreements' and/or 'disagreements'.
- ◆ Units II A/B, ES4 question 5 (How fully?): candidates were not exploiting presented evidence as fully as possible. Further accurate and relevant recalled detail, on DORA in particular, proved problematic for many candidates.
- ◆ Unit III C/D, ES2 question 3 (Comparing): not as well done as in IIIA/B since candidates had to link to **effects/impact** as in II A/B, so for candidates tackling the most common contexts this proved more demanding.

## Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

### General points of advice common to C/G/F

- ◆ It is permissible, and indeed essential given marker feedback and PA Referrals this year, for Centres to liaise with Invigilators to directly instruct candidates on which contexts to answer, to ensure that wrong or multiple contexts are not attempted. For example, at C/G, candidates should highlight the correct options displayed on the front cover page, and at Foundation candidates should tick the appropriate boxes on page 3. (Please see page 55 of Invigilators' handbook)
- ◆ Centres should advise candidates against writing in pencil or red pen: only black or blue pen should be used. This should ensure greater legibility.
- ◆ When candidate scripts are being typed or transcribed on laptops, please use double spacing to allow markers enough room to employ correction codes and annotate marks.
- ◆ Candidates should be encouraged and trained to read all questions and instructions carefully to avoid misinterpretation and irrelevance. Candidates should do what the question asks, not what they prefer.

- ◆ Candidates should be trained to make full use of pictorial sources both at KU and ES.
- ◆ Candidates should be trained to recognise the worth of secondary sources and historians when evaluating sources.
- ◆ Candidates should be discouraged from attempting KU and ES sections out of sequence as this can be to their disadvantage.
- ◆ All General/Foundation candidates should be trained in the Foundation paper format to best prepare them for the different requirements of this exam.
- ◆ Care should also be taken to ensure that candidates are presented at the correct levels, with sufficient valid and reliable evidence to support potential, especially absentee, appeals. In this respect Centres should review all commercial and in-house prelim papers to ensure that these meet the criteria outlined in SQA Guidance.
- ◆ Centres should note that all areas of the syllabus can and will be sampled. Areas that are sampled at one level will not be sampled at an adjacent level.

## **Foundation**

- ◆ At ES1, differentiate between primary and secondary sources.
- ◆ Follow ES2 prompts for agreement: (Source D says ... and also Source E says...) and disagreement: (Source G says ... but Source H says ...).
- ◆ Select evidence from both sources, as directed, and avoid combining points to achieve full marks in the ES5 table. Minimalist quotes should be discouraged, and 'stand alone' quotes encouraged rather than candidate paraphrasing (the original meaning can be lost in translation).
- ◆ Make the connection between 'Investigating' questions ES5 and ES6, ie use the information in the preceding table to reach a conclusion. NB centres should avoid using past or commercial papers with out-of-date ES1/2/5/6 items to ensure that candidates are properly prepared and not confused by exam format. This is also imperative to ensure that evidence is valid for any potential appeals procedures.

## **General/Credit**

- ◆ Provide recall at KU and, where required, at ES (ES4/6)
- ◆ In terms of KU at G/C, centres need to train/direct candidates to know that all areas of the syllabus can and will be examined, including less 'popular' topics.
- ◆ It is imperative that candidates make a direct connection between presented evidence/recall and process where required eg KU2/3. NB, however, at Credit this link/connection

to process must be made for each point of recall unless in the short essay, usually KU3, where an overt connection to the process must be made twice (ie once each in two separate paragraphs). Paragraphs must be at least two sentences long.

In terms of ES at G/C, centres need to train/direct candidates to:

- ◆ ES1: avoid 'mantras' that are not supported with relevant presented/recalled evidence and be aware of the value of a 'secondary source' as well as the limitations of a 'primary source'.
- ◆ ES1/4/6: cite specific examples of presented/recalled evidence rather than generalised statements (such as 'it is useful because of the detail it gives/when it was written' etc) to support a judgement
- ◆ ES1/5: avoid conflated responses, making discrete rather than combined points.
- ◆ ES5: use tables as a preferred structure here and avoid the unnecessary and time-consuming practice of 'quote and explain.' No explanation/recall is required here and only serves to affect timing – remember that this was designed as a note-making exercise to prepare for reaching a conclusion in the ES6 which follows. NB, direct/verbatim quotes are perfectly acceptable here as long as they are explicit, avoid over-use of ellipsis, and can 'stand alone'.
- ◆ Minimalist quotes should be discouraged along with candidate paraphrasing (whereby the original meaning can be lost in translation).
- ◆ ES6: read and follow the instructions about using evidence 'from the sources and from your own knowledge to reach a balanced conclusion' to achieve full marks, otherwise a maximum of 2 marks can only be awarded here.
- ◆ ES2: provide developed comparisons by adopting the following structure: Both sources agree that ... because Source A says that ... and Source B also says/agrees that... OR the sources disagree about ...because Source A says that... but Source B says that ... NB Candidates should be discouraged from presenting comparisons in lists, bullet points or tabular form. Such responses will be marked out of half marks.
- ◆ ES3: look for a precise attitude and avoid continually copying out quotes to support an initial holistic point, eg 'He says that ...'
- ◆ ES4: read and follow the instructions about using evidence 'from the source(s) and from your own knowledge' to achieve full marks — and be aware that two sources may be used here.
- ◆ NB Candidates should not be taught or encouraged to answer all ES questions before attempting KU as they are endangering their time-management and may inadvertently mix and match contexts, which may result in a Grade 7 being awarded for KU.

- ◆ Please note that additional advice on syllabus content/question types and technique/marking procedures and instructions can be found on the SQA website, along with animated PowerPoint and scanned script presentations showing how marks are awarded on exemplar F/G/C scripts for all contexts.

## Statistical information: update on Courses

### STANDARD GRADE

<b>Number of resulted entries in 2011</b>	19357
---	-------

<b>Number of resulted entries in 2012</b>	19481
---	-------

## Statistical Information: Performance of candidates

### Distribution of overall awards

Grade 1	25.3%
Grade 2	26.4%
Grade 3	17.7%
Grade 4	12.8%
Grade 5	11.7%
Grade 6	4.1%
Grade 7	2.0%
No award	0.0%

### Grade boundaries for each assessable element in the subject included in the report

Assessable Element	Credit Max Mark	Grade Boundaries		General Max Mark	Grade Boundaries		Foundation Max Mark	Grade Boundaries	
		1	2		3	4		5	6
KU	24	16	10	20	13	9	14	9	6
ES	36	25	17	30	19	14	21	15	11
KU	24	16	10	20	13	9	14	9	6