

Research and Information Services

MONITORING STANDARDS REPORT



Comparison of History CSYS 1992, 1998 and Advanced Higher 2004

Preamble

The group met formally twice, with a considerable amount of the preparatory work relating to the syllabus and marking instructions carried out by e-mail and telephone. Although 10 days' work for three people was allocated by the SQA, the two meetings, preparatory work and writing the report took up longer than this allocation. Most of the time during the two meetings was taken up by discussing the scripts provided by SQA. However, the monitoring exercise was made somewhat more difficult by the lack of dissertations for 1992, no A scripts for 2004 (although some were able to be supplied by the present Principal Assessor), no Marking Instructions for 1992, and the deletion of the marks given to answers on some scripts. Nonetheless the evidence provided by SQA allowed the group to answer the key questions.

Summary of findings

1 What are the differences in the arrangements?

There have been changes to the Fields of Study with some dropping out to be replaced by other topics. The Study in Depth has been dropped but some of the areas therein have been subsumed within the Field of Study itself.

2 What effect have these changes had on the level of demand?

Prior to the changes brought about by Higher Still it was possible for candidates to focus on a relatively narrow range of topics within their chosen Field of Study. By 2002, this was no longer possible since candidates had to cover a far wider range of topics to fulfil the assessment requirements. This makes the course more demanding.

Moreover, the introduction of internal assessment further added to these demands.

3 Differences between the Question Papers and Marking Instructions

The examination has always contained two Papers or parts. Paper 1 sets essay type questions which have remained relatively unchanged. The major changes have taken place in Paper 2 which has moved to source based questions as opposed to a combination of these and questions asking candidates to comment on a text that they had studied. The final part of the course to be assessed, the Dissertation, has remained largely unchanged. Marking Instructions have become far more detailed and important documents in their own right. The Marking Instructions now place far more emphasis on historiography and contextualisation of sources. Candidates are now required to address a wider range of points when evaluating sources.

4 What effect have these changes had on the level of demand?

The greater emphasis on historiography places additional demands on candidates and this is reflected in the comparison of scripts described below. The removal of the question asking candidates to comment on a text which they had studied takes away a question which candidates found difficult, but the level of source analysis now required is more demanding in the past.

5 Comparison of A and C scripts

Paper 1 (essay)

A-rated scripts in 1992 and 1998 would not be A-rated in 2004 largely due to the lack of historiography in the answers. However, the difference between 1998 and 2004 was less marked than between 1992 and 2004. Indeed the group was of the opinion that some of the B-rated scripts in 1992 were of a higher standard than the A scripts. C-rated scripts were comparable across 1992, 1998 and 2004.

Paper 2 (source)

A-rated scripts in 1992 and 1998 would not have been rated as A in 2004 although this is partly due to the nature of the questions set.

C-rated scripts were slightly over-marked in 1992 and 1998 compared to 2004 although the difference was minor.

Dissertation

None for 1992. Some of those in 1998 would not have been awarded A passes in 2004 but others were on the B/A borderline.

The C-rated Dissertations were comparable in 1998 with 2004.

1 Syllabus

1.1 General approach

The general rationale and aims of Advanced Higher History have remained broadly similar between 1992 and 2004. In 1992 the Course aimed to provide students with 'an opportunity to proceed further with the study of History and so develop at greater depth the skills associated with it'. This had evolved by 2004 into allowing students 'to acquire depth in the knowledge and understanding of historical themes and to develop skills of analysing issues, developments and events, drawing conclusions and evaluating sources'.

The Course encourages students to work more independently than Higher, although a high level of teacher input is desirable. Students who studied the Course in 1992 would recognise elements of the Course in 2004, with the emphasis on essay writing, historiography, source analysis and interpretation alongside a Dissertation. Moreover, a core of Fields of Study has been maintained, although the chronological periods within some fields have been altered. Alongside this core, other fields have either been added or removed from the syllabus. Students would find the Higher Still terminology somewhat unfamiliar, with two mandatory units in 2004 — The Historical Study and Historical Research. However, the work therein finds parallels with the requirements in 1992. In 1992 the course required students to:

1. evaluate the opinions of secondary authorities who hold differing historical views;
2. interpret source material;
3. carry out an intensive study within a limited field, placing this field within its wider historical context.

The rationale for Advanced Higher since the advent of Higher Still in 1998 states that students should ‘handle detailed information...’, ‘use this analysis to address complex historical issues, including consideration of alternative interpretations...’, ‘interpret a range of complex primary and secondary sources...’, and ‘undertake the planning, research, preparation and presentation of a dissertation...’.

Internal assessment since 1998 has become an essential part of the rationale. Internal assessment has placed additional demands on candidates. Candidates now require to pass internal and external assessment whereas in the past the external examination and dissertation sufficed. Internal assessment also places greater demands on candidates during the course and more especially towards the end as centres try to ensure that the National Assessment items are passed by the deadline. Strong anecdotal evidence suggests that procedures are often less rigorous than the SQA may believe.

Differences in course content and external assessment are dealt with below under 1.2.3 and 2.1 respectively.

1.2 Elements added or deleted

The basic elements of Advanced Higher History syllabus are largely unchanged from CSYS with the assessment of knowledge and understanding alongside the ability to evaluate sources and undertake historical research. The course continues to place considerable emphasis on the ability to compose detailed written historical arguments.

1.2.3 Have any parts of the syllabus been changed?

Many of the fields of study in 1992 continue to 2004, although the some of timeframes have altered to take into account the need to reduce content

coverage, especially following the introduction of Higher Still. The topics which have continued throughout are:

1. Northern Britain. In 1992 this covered from the Iron Age to the Vikings. By 2002 the period was from the Romans to AD 1000, although the earlier period was still regarded as essential background information.
2. Scottish Independence. In 1992 this was within 1100-1329. By 2002, the period was 1286-1329.
3. The Renaissance in Italy. In 1992 this was not defined within a time frame, but by 2002 it was confined to the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.
4. The House Divided: USA 1850-1865 (no alteration to the chronological period).
5. Germany: Versailles to the Outbreak of World War Two. By 2002 this had been cut back from the Nuremberg Trials to the Outbreak of World War Two.
6. Soviet Russia 1917-1953. By 1998 the end point had been cut back from 1956 to 1953.

Two fields of study in 1992 were dropped by 1998:

1. The Medieval Achievement;
2. Scotland: Restoration to Union.

Five fields of study had been added by 1998:

1. Britain at War and Peace 1939-1951.
2. South Africa 1910-1984.
3. Scotland: Reformation to Restoration.
4. Industrial Archaeology.
5. Britain at War and Peace.

By 2001 the following fields had been added:

1. Georgians and Jacobites: Scotland 1715-1800.
2. Japan; From Medieval to Modern State 1850s-1920.
3. The Spanish Civil War 1931-1939.

And the following had been discontinued:

1. Industrial Archaeology.
2. Scotland: Reformation to Restoration.

In 2003, The Economic Development of Britain 1820-1880 had been dropped.

This now gives a choice of twelve fields and demonstrates a willingness to change the syllabus in line with student uptake and changes to historiography. The fields of study are:

1. Northern Britain from the Romans to AD 1000.
2. Scottish Independence: 1286-1329.
3. The Renaissance in Italy in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries.
4. France in the Age of Louis XIV.
5. Georgians and Jacobites: Scotland 1715-1800.
6. The House Divided: USA 1850-1865.
7. Japan: From Medieval to Modern State 1850s-1920.
8. Germany: Versailles to the Outbreak of World War Two.
9. South Africa 1910-1984.
10. Soviet Russia 1917-1953.
11. The Spanish Civil War 1931-1939.
12. Britain at War and Peace 1939-1951.

One significant change resulting from Higher Still was dropping the Study in Depth, which featured in 1992 and 1998. For example, the Study in Depth in the House Divided covered the Civil War, 1861-1865. In Germany: Versailles to the Nuremberg Trials, the Study in Depth related to the Weimar Republic. The 1998 syllabus gave a detailed outline as to the content which had to be covered, namely:

The circumstances of the Republic's creation and early development: loss of war, November Revolution, Treaty of Versailles, social and political instability, economic and hyper-inflation crisis; relative stabilisation in the mid-1920s, currency reform, Dawes Plan, social welfare provision, the Stresemann era in foreign affairs; the depression and mass unemployment, demise of parliamentary democracy, presidential cabinet from Brüning to Schleicher, ascent of totalitarianism and the victory of Nazism.

Much of this content is now subsumed within the Field of Study. For example, students must now study the following content relating to Weimar:

*The creation of the Weimar Republic, including military defeat, the November Revolution and the Treaty of Versailles; social and political instability, economic crisis and hyper-inflation.
A period of relative stability, including currency reform and the Dawes Plan, social welfare provision, the Stresemann era in foreign affairs.
The collapse of Weimar, including economic depression and mass unemployment; the weakening of democracy, Brüning to Schleicher, the rise of Nazism; Hitler and the Nazi takeover of power.*

Within the German topic, in 1998 students would have studied the approach of the Second World War with its implications for internal German policy and international relations; the Second World War; war guilt and the Nuremberg Trials. All of these areas are missing from the 2002 syllabus and the same feature of reduced content coverage applies to other Fields.

Although the syllabus has been reduced, candidates now must study a wider range of topics within the Field of Study rather than taking a tactical decision to study a narrower range by, for example, concentrating on the Study In Depth.

1.2.4 Have these changes affected level of demand?

Although it might appear that reducing the content in some Fields of Study reduces the overall demand of the Course, this is in fact not the case. By 2004, the Course was more demanding because candidates had to cover the whole syllabus.

Although it is a value judgement, the dropping of certain topics could be seen as detrimental. For example, the Nuremberg Trials have a continued relevance evidenced in The Hague Tribunal resulting from the Balkan Wars of the 1990s. However, in 'The House Divided', the content has remained relatively unaltered, a situation unique to this Field.

1.3 Has the depth/breadth changed?

It follows from points made in 1.2.4 that in most Fields both the depth and the breadth have been reduced. In 1992, a student studying Scottish Independence would have been introduced to the Field by an examination of Anglo-Scottish relations from the late eleventh century against the background of Anglo-French settlement in Scotland. By way of contrast, a student in 2001 began studying the period just before 1286 by looking at the nature of royal authority under Alexander III and relationships between Scotland and England. Within Soviet Russia the breadth has been reduced to omit Khrushchev and the rejection of Stalin, which had been included in the 1992 syllabus.

The group wishes to emphasise that this reduction in breadth and depth has not reduced the overall demands of the Course for candidates.

2 Assessment Instrument

2.1 Changes in Question Papers and Marking Instructions

Question Paper

In 1992, the examination consisted of a Dissertation, a written paper of 2 hours' duration in which candidates wrote two essays from a choice of ten designed to examine the chosen Field and the study in depth. A further written paper of 1 ½ hours required candidates to evaluate two of four sources and comment on a text/source of their choosing.

The working group has found it difficult to establish the marks allocated to questions in 1992 as these are not indicated on the question paper and scripts do not show marks, just grades viz A, A- etc.

The weighting given to the Dissertation was equal to that for the combined written papers and it was not to exceed 4000 words.

By 1998 Paper 1 had changed to one question from the general Field and one from the Study in Depth, and in Paper 2 there were three compulsory

questions on evaluating sources and one 20-mark question asking candidates to comment on primary/secondary material they had studied. The Dissertation remained unchanged. However, by 2004 the structure of examination had been significantly altered. The Dissertation continued at a recommended length of 4000 words but it now counted for only 50 out of the total possible marks of 140. In the opinion of the group this has increased the difficulty of the Course by reducing the weighting given to the Dissertation.

The remaining marks came in one examination paper of three hours, which was divided into two parts:

- ◆ Part 1 now consisted of six essay questions based on the chosen Field with candidates required to answer two. Each essay was marked out of 25.
- ◆ Part 2 continued to provide four sources, all of which had to be analysed to answer the three questions set. Questions were marked out of either 12 or 16, with 16 marks allocated to source comparison. One additional change was the move towards including secondary sources in Part 2. The review of sources, where candidates evaluated either a given text or one of their choice, which featured in earlier years had been dropped by 2002.

Nevertheless, the questions set in Paper 1 remain broadly comparable. For example, in the 1992 examination on Scottish Independence one question asked candidates, 'Who was to blame for the predicaments of King John during his reign?' In 2004, candidates were asked, "He was king but for a little while." To what extent were his own subjects to blame for the short duration of the rule of King John?

In Germany: Versailles to Nuremberg/World War Two, candidates in 1992 were asked, "The Weimar Republic is too frequently described as a failure." Do you agree? And in 2004, 'Why did the Weimar Republic fail to live up to the expectations of its founders?'

Questions in Paper 2 have undergone a more radical change. In 1992 only one of the four questions referred to the sources. The remaining question asked candidates to comment on other primary and secondary sources which they had studied as exemplified by question 4 in Soviet Russia: 'What textbook on the years 1917 to 1924 do you consider particularly useful and why?' By 1998, three of the questions related to the sources with the fourth asking candidates to comment on the historiography of the period. In 2004, the three questions each related to the sources although recalled knowledge was required in answers. For example, in Soviet Russia candidates were asked, 'How adequately does Source C reflect the reality of Soviet foreign policy under Lenin after 1917?' Moreover, candidates were required to include historiography in their answers for the highest marks so placing an additional challenge for candidates.

One result of this change is that the sources in Paper 2 were by 2004 moving towards a more consistent length than in 1992. For example, in Paper 2 in

the 1992 examination for Scottish Independence the three sources took up 18 lines, but those for The Medieval Achievement ran to 45 lines. There is no evidence to suggest that the content of the sources has been made 'easier' during the period in question.

A further point to note is that secondary sources were by 2004 used more widely which in some cases makes them more accessible, but guards against over use of a narrow range of primary sources.

Marking Instructions

Examination: General Comments

In many respects there have been significant changes to the Marking Instructions. There are no extant instructions for 1992. Those for 1994 are lacking for some Fields, lacking detail in other Fields, but slightly more detailed in others.

The Marking Instructions for 1998 were more detailed than in 1994 with general instructions on the qualities being looked for in Paper 1 and Paper 2 answers. This was supplemented by detailed instructions for most (but not all) Fields. For example, there were no instructions for Northern Britain from the Romans to c. 1000AD.

By 2004, however, the Marking Instructions were important documents in their own right, deliberately designed to assist teachers, lectures and candidates. From none in 1992, the 2004 instructions stretched to 160 pages. The scrutiny group would wish to record that this represents significant additional demands on setters, but one welcomed by the profession when allied to the increased availability of the instructions via the internet as opposed to the (often fictional) confidentiality in the past.

Given the incomplete nature of the Marking Instructions the group decided to chart changes to Marking Instructions through one Field, namely, The House Divided, with confirmation of significant changes confirmed by reference to other Fields. The content of The House Divided has been relatively unchanged and it has relatively detailed instructions in 1994, 1998 and 2004.

Paper 1: 1994

The instructions briefly outlined the key anticipated points, with additional points noted for good and very good answers. The average length for the instructions was 10 lines per question. There was no reference to either historiography or general guidance as to what could be expected in C, B and A answers.

1998

More detailed general and specific guidance was provided in the instructions. Under general guidance, the instructions noted that candidates' answers were being credited according to their success in nine key areas: relevance; the extent to which answers make the various distinctions required by the questions; coherence; sustained argument; explanation, analysis and discussion; context; understanding of concepts; awareness of different historical views; and reference to secondary authorities.

The instructions also provided guidance as to the basic features of C, B and A answers. C answers would demonstrate 'reasonable' awareness of the key areas, with A answers noted for demonstrating features such as 'a firm understanding', 'thorough awareness of different historical views', and 'a well-developed analysis'.

This was reinforced in the specific instructions for questions with points, more detailed than in 1994, given for a basic (C-13-14 marks), sound (B-15-17 marks) and excellent (A-18-25 marks). Excellent answers featured detailed explanations and contextualised writing. Interestingly, although the general instructions referred to awareness of differing historical views, these were often not detailed in the specific instructions. Under point 3 below the group notes that an analysis of scripts demonstrates that candidates could achieve good passes without reference to historiography.

2004

Here the specific instructions fell into two formats. Most setters gave the points of possible contextual information required for each level of answer — C, B or A. Other setters added to this outline a general preamble setting the historical context and key issues. Many of these preambles were lengthy, detailed and consequently helpful to markers.

Compared to 1994 and 1998, the instructions placed more explicit emphasis on the historical context and the differing views of historians. Indeed the instructions gave the names of historians and their views.

C-pass essays contained a basic coverage of the issue, underlying reasons and 'some awareness of differing historical interpretations'. B-pass essays were more developed with wider explanations and reasons alongside 'greater awareness of differing historical interpretations'. A-pass answers contained fuller detail, analysis and evidence with 'clear evidence of understanding the views of different historians with examples given'. A further differentiating factor was the ability to place into wider context the issue, development and/or event referred to in the question.

The scrutiny group is of the opinion that this increased emphasis on historiography places additional demands on candidates in 2004 when compared with 1992 and 1998, but partly reflects the greater emphasis in modern texts on historical debates.

Paper 2: 1994 (used as reference point due to absence of Marking Instructions for 1992)

The instructions gave in prose style the key points which should have been given in answers. These were not listed under headings such as author, purpose etc., although reference to these was expected in answers. The instructions also did not give the level of marks to be allocated for different types of answer.

For questions asking ‘what does Source- tell us...?’ Candidates were expected to comment on authorship, content and any limitations of the source.

Source comparison questions normally referred to a specific issue, for example, ‘By comparing Sources A and C, what issues of fundamental disagreement may be said to have existed between North and South?’ The Marking Instructions encouraged candidates to concentrate on content with some reference to authorship, where relevant, and limitations of the sources.

In questions asking candidates to comment on the sources/text which they had studied, credit was given for close and critical reading alongside the complexity of the source/s and the quality of candidates’ evaluation of the sources’ analysis of the issue.

1998

The Marking Instructions in 1998 were laid out in a very different style to those in 1994. They began with general instructions relating to the objectives of the course in terms of knowledge, understanding and evaluating. They further emphasised that instructions could not cover every possible answer and that markers should use their professional judgement in assessing how well a question had been answered.

For the source-based questions, relevant points were listed under those from the sources and those from recall. Guidance was given for each question on the types of response appropriate to particular ranges of marks. For example, 1-2 marks were to be awarded for answers which were restricted to a description of source content. Additional marks were gained by greater depth to the analysis of how the sources related to the issue, relevant comments on authorship and detailed reference to the wider context.

The instructions for source comparison gave credit for those answers which moved beyond a mere summary comparing points in the sources to ones which gave ‘a comprehensive and accurate comparison of the documents with a full explanation of the reasons for the change, showing knowledge of the context’.

For questions asking candidates to comment on sources/texts, up to 5 marks could be awarded for descriptions and generalised comments. Good answers

were expected to contain a closely argued analysis of the value of the sources, their advantages and disadvantages, with specific references to how the source/s enhanced understanding of the issues raised by the question.

2004

By 2004 the Marking Instructions had become even more structured with candidates in turn expected to produce structured answers. The instructions for questions asking candidates to comment on, for example, the light thrown on an issue by a source listed points under headings such as:

- ◆ origin
- ◆ purpose
- ◆ points from the source
- ◆ points from recall providing wider contextualization
- ◆ conclusion

The instructions then went on to state the marks to be allocated for various types of answer, with maximum marks reserved for an accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument, solid grasp of context and significance of material alongside well developed levels of relevant analysis.

As before, the instructions for source comparison emphasised content over authorship although the latter was credited where relevant. It is interesting to note that compared to, for example, Intermediate 2 the instructions were more flexible and did not list direct points of comparison in a tabular format. Candidates were credited with analysing each source coming to a conclusion on their views on the issue. Additional marks could be gained by explaining the accuracy of the views expressed.

The increasingly detailed Marking Instructions suggest that additional demands have been placed on candidates who were by 2004 expected to comment on specific areas rather than the more open ended answers in the past. The group has already expressed the view that the emphasis on historiography is a more demanding expectation than asking candidates to comment on the sources, which they had studied. The group is also of the opinion that the increased requirement to contextualise sources sets a more demanding standard.

However, it is important to emphasise that changes in the structure and detail of Marking Instructions do not of themselves imply increasing demands on candidates. They also reflect the calls for greater openness and clarity from examining teams. It may have been the case that many of the requirements, which were by 2004 explicit in the Marking Instructions, were implicit in 1992. To some extent this can be clarified by studying candidate answers as under Point 3 below.

Dissertation

There are no Marking Instructions for the Dissertation for 1992, so a comparison can only be made between 1998 and 2004. Between these years there have been no significant changes. For example, an 'A' Dissertation has to demonstrate sophisticated analysis; considerable awareness of historical debate; reference to the views of secondary authorities; coherent high quality arguments; coherent synthesis; high quality of thought in the conclusion, evidence of wide-ranging research. These criteria have remained unchanged between 1998 and 2004.

Two additions in 2004 were clear statements regarding penalties for excessive length and procedures in the case of suspected malpractice.

2.2 Similarity of tasks in recent and older Papers

As noted above, questions in Paper 1 are broadly similar although fewer in number in 2004 than in 1992.

In Paper 2 there have been greater changes since by 2004 every question was based on a source. In 1998 there were three source based questions with the remaining question asking candidates to comment on either a primary or secondary source which had been studied. In 1992 there was only one source based question with the remaining question, from a choice of three, asking candidates to comment on a source/text which had been studied. This makes any comparison of standards more problematic for Paper 2, especially given the absence of marking instructions for 1992.

2.2.1 Do candidates perform the same on these questions?

No, candidate performance has changed between 1992, 1998 and 1998 for each part of the external assessment.

2.2.2 Discernable trends

By 2004, candidate answers to Paper 1 essays had significantly improved with the best answers much more focussed on the question and bringing in a far greater range of historiography. In Paper 2 source based questions, answers covered a much wider range of points rather than the more interpretative answers in 1992 and 1998.

Overall, candidates by 2004 were producing better essays, source evaluations and Dissertations.

2.3.1 Coverage of the syllabus

This is often a controversial area, with some teachers and lectures claiming that important parts of the syllabus have not been covered in the examination. However, the group is of the opinion that Advanced Higher History examinations are notable for their broad coverage, a feature that has remained constant. For example, in the 1992 examination Paper 1 questions on Germany: Versailles to the Nuremberg Trials covered the broad themes within the syllabus. There were questions on the German Revolution, Treaty

of Versailles, Weimar, Stresemann, the Reichswehr, Nazi consolidation of power, National Socialism, Nazi Foreign Policy, Opposition to Nazi Rule and German surrender in 1945.

The more limited syllabus in 2004 was examined with questions on opposition to Versailles, economic and political crises in 1923, Weimar, the economic depression of 1929-1932, use of terror by the Nazis and Hitler's foreign policy.

2.4.1 Level of demand of Questions and Marking Instructions

Essay questions in Paper 1 have remained broadly comparable, although in 1998 compared to 2004 there were more questions based on over-arching themes (although candidates could avoid these). Some of the question stems in 1992 introduced multiple issues, but others were quite specific.

It is difficult to compare Paper 2 type questions as they have changed significantly over the period. By 2004 there was no choice in the questions which had to be answered and no question asking candidates to comment on a source/text which had been studied during the course. Questions in 2004 were moving towards a more standardised format of question stem.

In 2004 there was a greater consistency of demand across Fields within the source questions. By way of contrast, in the 1998 examination for Soviet Russia one of the three source questions required a comparison of 3 sources, but other Fields had no comparison question at all.

However, the fundamental differences in the source based questions asked means that the group could not reach any definitive conclusion as to comparative demands, but the 20 mark historiography question in 1992 and 1998 often caused greater difficulties for candidates than the questions set in 2004.

The Marking Instructions for Paper 1 and 2 in 2004 were more rigorous and demanded that candidates earned marks by discussing a wider range of features than in the past. Although there was no longer a historiography question in 2004, there was a stated requirement that historiography featured in candidate answers throughout the examination. In 1992, the opening of a source question with a stem such 'discuss the significance of... ' invited a far wider range of possible responses than in 2004. Overall, therefore, the Marking Instructions as well as becoming more detailed have become more demanding for candidates. However, the greater openness by the Scottish Qualifications Authority in publicising these Marking Instructions has assisted centres.

3 Scripts

Analysis of the scripts sent for monitoring revealed the following findings.

Paper 1 (essays) A-rated scripts

1992: Many of these would not have been graded as A scripts in 2004. In fact in some cases they would not even pass the exam. Many of the answers were relatively brief and lacking in detail. Scripts were also notable for the absence of historiography, which would have been a fail in 2004. Some other A scripts would have been rated at B in 2004, reflecting the varied quality of A-rated scripts in 1992.

1998: Here the contrast with 2004 was less marked than in 1992. However, many of the A-rated scripts would still not have merited an A-pass in 2004. Compared to 2004, many of the A scripts were of a B standard. The answers were notable for being descriptive and lacking historiography.

2004. In contrast to previous years the A scripts (provided by the Principal Assessor) were detailed, focused on the question with pertinent reference to the views of historians, and were worth the A grade awarded.

Paper 1 (essay) B-rated scripts

1992. Here the Group was a concerned at the apparent inconsistency in marking, with some of the B scripts of a higher standard than the A scripts. Consequently, some of the B scripts would have been graded at A in 2004. Other B scripts were well argued and detailed but lacking in historiography, which would have been penalised in 2004.

1998. As with the 1992 scripts, the Group considered that some of the B scripts had been marked relatively severely and would have added 2 or 3 marks to bring the total up to an A standard. However, the difference was less marked than in 1992.

2004. The Group confirmed the B awards given.

Paper 1 (essay) C-rated scripts

1992 The C-rated answers were comparable with those in 1998 and 2004 being largely narrative and not tightly focused on the question.

1998. The C-rated scripts were comparable with those in 1992 and 2004 once again being largely narrative.

2004. The Group confirmed the grades given.

Paper 1 (essay) D-rated scripts

1992. The D-rated scripts were comparable to those in 1998 and 2004 being unstructured and not focused on the question.

1998. As in 1992, the D scripts were comparable with 2004.

2004. The Group confirmed the grades given.

Paper 2. Source-Based

Here it must be emphasised that the type of questions varied over the sample years.

Paper 2 (source) A-rated scripts

1992. The A-rated scripts were slightly over-marked compared with 2004. The phrasing of the question encouraged an 'English type' interpretative answer. There was less contextual recall than would be expected in 2004.

The answers to questions asking candidates to evaluate a text which had been studied were regarded as vague and unsatisfactory (there was no equivalent question in 2004).

1998. Here the answers were good on interpreting sources but less good on bringing in recalled knowledge and, as in 1992, the scripts had been slightly over-marked compared to 2004.

2004. The Group confirmed the grades given.

Paper 2 (source) B-rated scripts

1992. Again compared to 2004 the scripts had been slightly over-marked by one or two marks with answers relatively short.

1998. It was difficult to find a B answer to any given source question. Of the two answers rated at B, both were slightly over-marked.

2004. The Group confirmed the grades given.

Paper 2 (source) C-rated scripts

1992. The marks given to the source based question were comparable to that given in 2004, but the group was concerned that some of the C-rated answers on a text which had been studied were of a higher standard than some of those given an A.

1998. Here it was difficult to find an answer rated at C, but from two examples it was agreed that the marking had been generous by one or two marks compared to 2004.

2004. The Group confirmed the grades given.

Paper 2 (source) D-rated scripts

1992 and 1998. These scripts were of a comparable standard to those in 2004.

Dissertation

There were no Dissertations for 1992. Those for 1998 were notable for having titles which would not have been approved in 2004. Some of the A-

rated Dissertations would not have been rated at A in 2004 since they were too narrative and lacking in historiography. However, one Dissertation rated at A was rated as being on the B/A borderline according to 2004 standards. The Dissertations rated at B, C and D were of a similar standard to their equivalents in 2004.