



## External Assessment Report 2010

Subject	<b>History</b>
Level	<b>Standard Grade</b>

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 (C/G/F) to be challenging but fair, with broad sampling of the main aspects of the syllabus. Overall performance varied according to ability, especially at the interfaces, ie good General candidates found the Foundation exam fairly straight-forward 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, especially for progression to Higher.

In line with 2009, significantly fewer incorrect and/or multiple contexts were attempted this year with reduced instances of candidates attempting KU and ES questions out of sequence. However, once again disappointingly, Markers reported increased instances, across C/G/F, of poor and indeed almost illegible handwriting — made worse by use of pencil rather than pen, or indeed by candidate use of red 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. Markers felt that, overall, precise language and clear wording presented little difficulty to most candidates, allowing them to follow the correct process. Candidates were writing more and including recall, albeit not required, with some very detailed answers provided. As in 2009, the majority of Markers felt that the overall standard of candidate response, both at KU and ES, had continued to improve. Candidates appeared well aware of and better prepared for the Units studied and demonstrated greater understanding of technique, which was reflected especially at ES. Once again significantly fewer candidates attempted the wrong or multiple contexts, with most completing every question and finishing the paper as a result. Overall, the 2010 Foundation paper, whilst still presenting a worthy challenge, was considered to be well-laid out, accessible and well tackled by candidates. Similarly, Gaelic-medium scripts did not seem to present candidates with any obvious difficulties.

## General

Most Markers felt that candidate scripts were of a very good standard, with some outstanding scripts and fewer poor responses, resulting in an improved performance overall. The vast majority of candidates completed the paper, with significantly fewer wrong or multiple contexts attempted; generally where this occurred in multiple numbers, it was peculiar to particular centres. Once again ES performance continued to improve and indeed appeared to be outstripping KU, which was done poorly overall by comparison. Most centres are clearly 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 again this year; a significant number omitted the required recall from their answers which were heavily reliant on presented evidence and minimalist, even from 'C/G' candidates. As noted last year, a lot of candidates are 'cleverly copying' or proving resourceful and deploying source information from other contexts as recall. This disparity 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'. Overall, the 2010 General paper was considered to be fair and balanced; with clear wording, appropriate sources and consistent questions examining a variety of topics across the breadth of the syllabus which provided opportunities for candidates to perform well if prepared.

## **Credit**

Once again, and as usual with Credit candidates, performance was mixed but, overall, Markers considered 2010 scripts to be of a reasonably high standard with some excellent answers, exhibiting good exam technique and demonstrating a general improvement on 2009. The majority of candidates completed the paper in the time allocated. Wrong contexts were rarely attempted. However, whilst fewer very poor scripts were noted, concern still remains about inappropriate presentations. The vast majority of Markers commented that overall ES continues to improve and, once again, is almost universally the stronger element for Credit and Credit/General candidates. ES marks were almost overwhelmingly better (except at ES4 and ES6 where recall is required) than those at KU, where relatively few candidates achieved very high scores by comparison. Clearly 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'. Candidate bias towards ES skills appears to have lessened any encouragement to learn accurate and specific factual information to support potential argument. Markers highlighted 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 then, the 2010 Credit paper was considered to be fair and accessible to the vast majority of candidates, with a broad choice of topics to provide enough opportunities for candidates to demonstrate knowledge and skills.

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

### **Foundation**

Markers commented positively about overall performance, noting a continued improvement at ES — in particular 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. As such, candidates appear better prepared, are writing more than 'one-word answers' and achieving marks in the higher range at both KU and ES. Essentially, ES1, 2, 3 and 5 all continue to show improvement, although ES6 remains problematic. To expand:

- ◆ ES1: continued to be noticeably much better done than in previous years, the adoption of a 'multi-choice' format making ES1 'How useful..?' questions more accessible, whilst promoting greater standardisation of challenge across contexts. Markers noted that

candidates also demonstrated a much better understanding of primary/secondary sources this year.

- ◆ ES2: once again additional or enhanced 'prompts' in answer 'stems' for comparison questions proved helpful and were followed well by candidates, resulting in a general improvement in marks achieved for this item.
- ◆ ES3: can cause difficulty for some, but a general improvement in performance was noted with candidates doing particularly well when identifying 'attitudes' in Unit 11, Question 4.
- ◆ ES5: with tabular page references helping candidates to focus on appropriate responses, this item is now being done well across all Unit 1A/B/C contexts.

Syllabus areas of note regarding very good candidate performance were as follows:

- ◆ Units 1A/B/C: KU questions were mostly well done.
- ◆ Unit 1B, Question 3 (mining): where, noticeably, candidates were presenting relevant and accurate recalled knowledge.
- ◆ Unit 11A: overall, better done than 11B.

## **General**

Unit 111 generally and 111D in particular were done well and prompted more relevant recall than elsewhere in the paper. Collectively 'Investigation' (ES1/5/6) questions were completed effectively, with most candidates picking up a lot of marks here — again demonstrating good practice by centres and candidates.

As noted, more and more centres are training candidates to handle the different ES techniques with confidence and once again this year potentially formulaic question types were done well.

- ◆ ES1: some outstanding answers were noted, with significantly fewer 'rehearsing a mantra'. However in Unit 1C only, some candidates continued to be confused by what constitutes a primary/secondary source (radio interview).
- ◆ ES2: this also showed much improvement, with some exceptional answers in Units 11 and 111. Markers noted far more evidence of developed comparisons and well taught technique.
- ◆ ES3: there were mixed messages here: some Markers highlighted better training in technique resulting in improved responses this year, but most noted otherwise (see later section). Most candidates tended to achieve a holistic mark, with many gaining another by using evidence in support of this.
- ◆ ES4: some improvement was noted here.

- ◆ ES5: once again this elicited best responses overall, most candidates achieving high or full marks. However, a minority still misunderstood the process and effectively pre-empted their conclusion by wrongly including recall in their response.

## **Credit**

Overall at KU, the following were highlighted by Markers:

- ◆ Units 1A/B/C: Question1, KU2 (migration/emigration) was generally considered accessible and well done, with most candidates demonstrating relevant KU. However, several Markers expressed concern about spurious and not wholly accurate statements that ascribed the causes of Scottish poverty/unemployment/homelessness/migration to Irish immigration — part of a widespread response by candidates across many centres.
- ◆ Units 111A: Question 1, KU2 (Tensions between Native Americans and white settlers) was answered well.
- ◆ Unit 111D: Question 2, KU1 (Treatment of the Jews) was generally answered very well, although some candidates mistakenly included accurate, albeit irrelevant, evidence outwith the time-frame of the question as asked.
- ◆ 8 mark short essays: showed continued improvement in that most candidates are now clearly well-trained in providing ‘essay’ structures, ie introduction, paragraphs and conclusion. However, many struggled with content (see later section). Some Markers highlighted 11A, Question 1(a) — the Naval Arms Race — as being well done.
- ◆ At ES, the vast majority of candidates are applying the appropriate process, with the exception of ES4 and ES6 where the required recalled KU was lacking. In particular it was noted that at:
  - ES2: responses were getting better with most candidates scoring very well; certainly more candidates are becoming well-practiced in providing developed comparisons than previously.
  - ES5: once again most candidates were well-versed here, almost all achieving high or indeed full marks, especially when using a table format as recommended.
- ◆ As at General, ‘Investigation’ questions (ES1/5/6) were almost universally done well collectively.

## **Areas which candidates found demanding**

### **Foundation**

Once again the ES6 item continued to challenge and was poorly done across all three Unit 1A/B/C contexts. Many candidates seemed unclear about what was required when ‘reaching a conclusion’. Specifically, there was not enough use of information from the previous Question 5 (ES5, table) to answer Question 6 (ES6). Many just made a holistic point which, albeit appropriate, was worthy of only 1 mark.

Areas of note regarding weaker candidate performance were as follows:

- ◆ Units 1A/B/C: KU2 (voting) — very few scored full marks by misreading the question and thereby wrongly including the distracter in their answer.
- ◆ Unit 11A: Question 2, KU2 (Alliances) — very few scored full marks, failing to make full use of the source.
- ◆ Unit 11A: ES1 — whilst the multi-choice format has generally led to an improved performance in this item type, Question 8 (League of Nations) was poorly done by comparison.
- ◆ Unit 11A: ES2 — candidates found Questions 2 and 6 difficult, rarely achieving full marks compared with very good/excellent performances elsewhere in this item type.
- ◆ Unit 11B: ES3, Question 4 (evacuees) — candidates struggled with identifying ‘attitudes’, compared with 11A.

## General

Areas of difficulty were mainly to do with lack of relevant recall and some, perhaps, more to do with misreading of questions and focusing on learned /preferred headings.

- ◆ Unit 1B/C: Question 2, KU2 (Suffragettes) — whilst Markers noted some very good answers, this item was clearly not easy for the majority of candidates, especially at ‘F/G’ and proved to be the most demanding question in Unit 1. There were two reasons for this. Firstly, most candidates described the methods/actions not the consequences/results of Suffragette militancy — although accurate this was irrelevant to the question being asked. Secondly, a distinct lack of recall resulted in few scoring full marks here — candidates experienced difficulty identifying additional negative implications — yet relevant selection of presented evidence should ensure 2 out of 3 marks here, if the question was read correctly.
- ◆ Unit 11A: Question 1, KU1 (Assassination at Sarajevo) resulted in some very long, highly embellished and quite vague answers here. This was inexplicably poorly attempted despite being both a ‘describe’ question and ‘popular’ content.
- ◆ Unit 11 A: Question 5, ES4 (Impact of tanks) — unfortunately a significant number of candidates omitted this question due to failure to observe an instruction to turn over the page. This was not the case in 11B where the layout allowed a similar question to face the others, rather than be overleaf. The issue will be addressed in the layout of future papers. In particular, the Setting Team will review how to enhance the wording /instruction under the preceding question, if candidates have to turn over, as the generic ‘Turn Over’ is clearly part of a greater generic type set-up.
- ◆ Unit 111D: Question 1, KU1 (Aims of Spartacists) — appeared to be harder than other contexts and was not done well, again due to two main issues. Firstly, most candidates described what happened during the Spartacist Uprising rather than the actual aims of

the Spartacists. Secondly, a distinct lack of recall resulted in few scoring full marks here. Many candidates, especially those at 'F/G', struggled with what some Markers considered to be a fairly extensive source in terms of detail provided and were unable to identify additional recall. In addition, it would appear to be an unpopular topic with both centres and candidates although an integral part of the syllabus.

- ◆ Unit 111A/B/C/D: KU2 (visual and text) — many candidates ignored the rubric and visual to focus solely on the text, thereby limiting potential answers.
- ◆ ES3, despite some improvement noted by Markers, this item is still poorly done and the weakest answer provided by most candidates across all contexts. (See Advice to Centres.)

### **Credit**

Generally at KU there was a worrying lack of recall across all Units/contexts, with candidates struggling to remember relevant, accurate and specific factual information to support answers.

- ◆ Units 1A/B/C: Question 1, KU2 (mills/mines/trade unions) was done badly. Candidates rarely achieved full marks due to a lack of relevant recall or through not answering the question as set. In 1A/B most described technological developments, dangers/solutions rather than the effects of new laws. It was not absolutely necessary to give very specific detail here, although detailed MI were provided as exemplification, but on the whole candidates expressed recall in terms of vague generalities and comments which, at most, were worthy of only one holistic mark. In 1C candidates most described the general aims/work of trade unions again as generalities without reference to specific, relevant historical evidence or events.
- ◆ Unit 11A: Question 1(a) 'Naval Arms Race' showed candidates not answering the question as set, describing rather than assessing its importance as a cause of WW1. Many candidates failed to realise that they could refer to other factors, including the alternative question stem as a prompt.
- ◆ NB 8 Mark Short Essay: KU3 (How important..?) should have led to balanced responses, as proved successful last year, but in 2010 essays were either very good or poor — partly due to lack of process, partly due to lack of recall (see above). To expand:
  - Many candidates struggled with specific, relevant and accurate factual detail — answers were frequently far too vague to merit a mark, candidates only writing in superficial generalisations.
  - Many candidates lacked the necessary 'judgement' integral to the process of addressing a KU3 'How important..?' question — describing rather than assessing, eg the Naval Race as a cause of World War One. So whilst many were providing a good account of events per se, they lost at least another process mark for not carrying out the evaluation that the question required.

Essentially, then, candidates need to read and answer questions as set whilst developing the necessary skills to learn and retain specific, relevant and accurate factual detail as supporting evidence for their answers — regardless of question type and mark allocation.

So whilst more candidates are clearly well-trained in essay structure, albeit some still encounter difficulty distinguishing a discrete introduction/conclusion, fewer are competent in retaining recalled knowledge.

- ◆ Unit 111D: Question 1, KU2 (unpopularity of Kaiser) was done badly and proved more difficult than ‘unpopularity of Tsar’ in 111C, the latter being more familiar, perhaps, than the former. Ignoring the wording and time span of the question, many candidates adopted a post-1918 focus, mistakenly linking his unpopularity with the terms of the Treaty of Versailles or Hitler.
- ◆ Unit 111C: was considered by some Markers to be less well done than other contexts — treatment of the Kulaks proving more difficult than treatment of the Jews (although the Kaiser/Tsar question balanced this out).

The following problem areas were identified at ES:

- ◆ ES1: as with last year, whilst some improvement was noted, this is still one of the weakest items where answers are generally a list of rehearsed ‘mantras’ — essentially a generic template to fit any source/context — with relatively few candidates achieving full marks here. Still too many focused on ‘content only’, lacking specific recall for accuracy/limitation. Many conflated responses, where the process was difficult to identify/disentangle (eg contemporaneity combined with authorship) also reduced potential marks.
- ◆ Once again there was an additional issue with ES1, although in Units 11A/B this year, where the inclusion of a secondary source threw many candidates — many are clearly not trained in this question type and simply reverse a primary source mantra (‘not a primary source’/ ‘not an eye-witness’). Markers found it very concerning that candidates value historians less than contemporary witnesses — this is clearly a priority for particular centres to address and one that was highlighted in last year’s PA Report.
- ◆ ES3: once again, and in the main, this remains worst done — most struggled to identify/express attitudes and at best most achieved 1 mark for a holistic point and another mark for a piece of supporting evidence, usually expressed as ‘The author says...’(hence 2 out of 4). In addition, some candidates are being wrongly coached to include recall and to refer to ‘typicality’, both of which are neither required nor credited.
- ◆ ES4: whilst demonstrating some improvement, most were reliant on presented evidence and deficient in relevant recall.
- ◆ ES6: across Units 1A/B/C candidate responses were generally weak on recall (indeed many confused and disguised presented evidence as recall) and many failed to recognise the need for balance and recall as well as providing presented evidence when

reaching a conclusion, resulting in an automatic fail here for many candidates. As highlighted last year, centres need to alert their candidates to the correct process.

## **Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates**

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

A reminder: centres should note that, since the original Unit 11A (1790s–1820s) of International Cooperation and Conflict has been removed from the exam at all levels, the remaining two contexts have been renumbered, with 11B becoming 11A and 11C becoming 11B respectively. Centres should adjust any mnemonics accordingly.

It is permissible 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, eg 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 irrelevancy: 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.

Centres should note that all areas of the syllabus can be sampled. Areas that are sampled at one level will not be sampled at an adjacent level.

At Foundation, centres need to train/direct candidates to:

- ◆ 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...).
- ◆ Make the connection between 'Investigating' questions ES5 and ES6, ie use the information in the preceding table to reach a conclusion.
- ◆ Select evidence from both sources, as directed, and avoid combining points to achieve full marks in the ES5 table.

NB centres should avoid using past SQA 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 centre evidence is valid for any potential appeals procedures.

At General, centres need to train/direct candidates to:

- ◆ 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
- ◆ Pay close attention to the timeframe of the context for which questions have been set eg Tsar ...in 1917 / Kaiser... in 1918 / Nazi Germany between 1933 and 1939 (111C:1914–1941) and (111D: 1918–1939). NB evidence beyond the timeframe will not be credited as relevant.

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

- ◆ ES1: avoid 'mantras' which 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.
- ◆ 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/disagrees 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...'
- ◆ ES4/6: read and follow the instructions about using evidence 'from the sources and from your own knowledge' to achieve full marks, and be aware that 2 sources may be used in ES4 items.
- ◆ ES5: use tables as a preferred structure here and avoid the unnecessary and time-consuming practice of 'quote and explain' — 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'.

- ◆ ES6: include balance, presented evidence and recall to achieve full marks.

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 SQA intends to provide additional advice on syllabus content/question types and technique/marking procedures; instructions will be found on SQA's website along with animated PowerPoint and scanned script presentations showing how marks were awarded on exemplar F/G/C scripts for all contexts examined this year.

## Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2009	20057
Number of resulted entries in 2010	19422

## Statistical information: performance of candidates

### Distribution of overall awards

Grade 1	25.5%
Grade 2	25.5%
Grade 3	19.7%
Grade 4	12.8%
Grade 5	12.0%
Grade 6	3.0%
Grade 7	1.5%
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	14	10	14	10	7
ES	36	25	17	30	20	15	21	15	11