



Questions & Answers

National 5 History question paper webinar: December 2021

1 'How fully...' question

You've suggested that 'quote and explain' is a good option for candidates, but how do they 'quote and explain' if it's a 'how fully ... describe question? Are they just putting it in their own words?

Examples are provided in the webinar. Some explanation is required to show understanding of the point being made. For example, Source C says that 'Wallace was taken to London by boat'. This was so that it was more difficult to make a rescue attempt.

Do you have to explain the quote to gain the mark? Is it not enough just to quote?

Some explanation is required to show understanding of the point being made.

Can you explain why that (William Wallace answer) would get a judgment mark credit?

The candidate provides a statement which demonstrates understanding of the partial value of the source. For example, 'The source partly explains ...' or 'The source quite fully describes...'

For the 'how fully ...', can you use Source A describes (question) 'to an extent' for judgement?

This would be acceptable.

Is the difference in the source rather than what the students have to do?

The describe source will have facts and point the candidate in this direction. The explain will have reasons. The skill being demonstrated is that of understanding the source and putting it in context, for both ways of wording the question.

To clarify, no linking to the question is required in the 'how fully... explain'?

A clear judgement on the question is required. For source points, the source point should be interpreted and for recall points, they should be relevant to the question asked.

What is the preferred judgement wording?

Please see the previous answer. Any statement that demonstrates understanding of the partial value of the source. For example, 'The source partly explains ...' or 'The source quite fully describes...'

For 'how fully ...', would a candidate receive credit for quoting then paraphrasing, rather than quoting then explaining?

The mark would be awarded for paraphrasing. Further examples can be found in the marking instructions for previous SQA past papers and on the Understanding Standards website.

'How fully ...' question: Do you have to explain the quote to gain the mark?

A candidate can either paraphrase or quote and explain.

How is quoting then saying "so this made them give up" interpreting the source point? Surely the main thing of the source point is that the military survey showed they couldn't win, not that they gave up?

The complete point made by the candidate is: 'The source also says the 'Japanese military conducted a survey that concluded that Japan could not win the war" so this made them give up.' The explanation, although very brief, is clearly linking to the question, which asks about the reasons for Japanese surrender. Therefore, it is credited.

Why are the examples of the 'how fully... describe', interpretations of the source point explanations?

These are intended to exemplify one way in which candidates can choose to answer the question.

I am still not clear about the difference between 'how fully ... describe' and 'how fully ... explain'. Please would you explain what the difference is in terms of what the candidates actually have to do?

See answers above. The describe source will have facts and point the candidate in this direction. The explain will have reasons. The skill being demonstrated is that of understanding the source and putting it in context, for both ways of wording the question.

The Wallace source had a judgement next to the 'Source A describes the capture and death of Wallace'. Surely this isn't a judgement? Then in the previous answers the judgement isn't marked as being credited.

For the first part of this question, the questioner has misread the candidate answer. The full quote is: 'Source A describes the capture and death of W.W. fully. (J)'. For the second part of this question, oral commentary from the webinar on the previous slides indicates that a judgement was being awarded for the previous answers. Subsequent annotation confirms this.

For candidate 3, what would the sentence need to get the other recall mark, about stronger USA army, or is that factually wrong?

The full quote from the answer is: 'The source misses out that the American and British Army was much stronger than the Japanese.' This is not credited because the candidate has expressed this historical point as a statement, not a reason. It is probably also incorrect to say that the Japanese surrendered owing to superior Allied military strength as this had not stopped them waging war on the USA and Britain.

Would candidates get a mark if they quoted and paraphrased?

The mark would be awarded for paraphrasing. Further examples can be found in the marking instructions for previous SQA past papers and on the Understanding Standards website.

For the first example, the paraphrase seemed to be the exact same words as the source. Is this still able to get a mark as paraphrasing? (Civil rights)

The candidate does put the source points in their own words, communicating in a way that shows they are interpreting the source. For example, for the first source point, the source says: 'Reverend Brown launched a legal action in the Supreme Court to win the right to send his child to a white school.' Candidate 1 says: 'The source tells us legal action took place in the Supreme Court to win the right to send his child to a white school.' The candidate has reworded the source point to accurately focus on the salient historical fact that non-violent action is the cause of the civil rights movement.

Do pupils need process for recall within the 'how fully ... explain' question?

The describe source will have facts and point the candidate in this direction. The explain will have reasons. The skill being demonstrated is that of understanding the source and putting it in context, for both ways of wording the question.

What happens if they (candidates) have attempted recall, but it is incorrect? Are they still capped at 2 out of 6?

The part of the answer affected would be disregarded in the awarding of the mark for the answer. If no relevant recall is given, the maximum mark that can be awarded is 2 out of 6.

In the candidate 1 example, there didn't seem to be much difference between the source and the paraphrased example in their first source point. How much do they need to move away from the wording of the source?

To be awarded a source mark, the candidate must interpret the source point. Each answer should be assessed on its merits and professional judgement applied.

Can you explain why the William Wallace answer would get a judgment mark credit?

The candidate is not being awarded a mark for the judgement. However, they have made a clear judgement on the question asked that is supported by evidence. Good practice on the judgement for the 'how fully ...' question has been highlighted in previous answers.

For the first 'how fully ...' example (civil rights), the first paraphrase seemed to be the exact same words as the source. Is this still meeting the standards for a mark as paraphrasing?

Please see previous answers.

Could I confirm that pupils would receive the source points in both the HFD [How fully does the source describe...] and HFE [How fully does the source explain...] for simply paraphrasing? For HFE [How fully does the source explain...] should they always start the recall points with the stem of the question, as in the explain answer?

In answer to the first part of the question, it is possible to paraphrase source points in both the 'how fully does the source describe...?' and in 'how fully does the source explain the reasons...?'

In answer to the second part of the question, the candidate should supply valid historical reasons. Examples of how this might be done are in the webinar slides. It is good practice to link to the question for each reason.

For 'how fully ... explain, for recall, do pupils have to use words of the question each time like the explain question?

Please see the previous answer.

In the 'how fully...explain' the source seems to contain historical facts and the explanation comes in the interpretation. Is this correct?

The source contains historical reasons, which have been interpreted by the candidate.

Candidate 8 doesn't seem to be explaining. Can you clarify how they get the mark?

The candidate says, 'There are many reasons why people immigrated to Scotland. One reason why many Irish people immigrated to Scotland was to escape dire poverty.' **(R)** They therefore identify a valid historical reason why many Irish people came to Scotland, which is clearly linked to the question asked.

They then go on to say, 'Another reason why many Irish people immigrated to Scotland was many Irish was starving to death because of the famine which destroyed their main food source the potato crop.' **(R)** They therefore identify a valid historical reason why many Irish people came to Scotland, which is clearly linked to the question asked.

They also say, 'Another reason why many Irish people immigrated to Scotland was there were better wages in Scotland.' **(R)** They therefore identify a valid historical reason why many Irish people came to Scotland, which is clearly linked to the question asked.

And finally they also say, 'Another reason why many Irish people immigrated to Scotland was because many Irish didn't own their own land and so were pushed out when landowners wanted to make more space for modern technology.' This reason was not credited as the candidate asserted that this was a reason why many Irish came to Scotland. The use of the word 'many' is probably historically inaccurate.

2 9-mark essay

For the introduction: Does the candidate need to do background? Can they state, 'The appeal of the Nazi's promises was a main reason for their rise to power however there were other reasons such as X Y Z...' and still get the mark?

For the introduction, a candidate can get a mark for providing a background sentence or outlining at least two factors. The example given in the question would be credited.

For the 9-marker, if they have got two factors but are only awarded K in one of the factors, can they still achieve balance?

Balance is awarded for relevant knowledge demonstrated over two factors.

'However, it was not just Hitler's promises that gained Hitler support.' Would that get a balance mark?

For the balance mark to be awarded, relevant knowledge has to be demonstrated. Candidates need two relevant and accurate points of knowledge from different factors to gain a balance mark.

Can they get a K + B mark for a single sentence like the second 9-mark candidate? I thought it had to be separate sentences.

In the example referred to, the candidate links explicitly to the question and also provides evidence to back this up, therefore fulfilling the criteria. There are a number of different ways in which a candidate might demonstrate the skill and the knowledge. The webinar provides a variety of examples of how candidates might do this.

For the supporting reason in the conclusion, can this be a point the candidate has already made in the essay, or should it be new evidence?

The purpose of a conclusion is not normally to provide new evidence. It may be a reason that had been made earlier in the response.

Do pupils need to deal with the isolating factor to access the full 9 marks?

This is good practice. Candidates who do not address the isolated factor may find it more difficult to gain marks for the conclusion.

How many times do candidates have to 'signpost'/ use words of the question for knowledge marks within 9-mark question?

It is good practice to signpost once for each factor.

Should we be preparing candidates for 'How successful ...' debate questions for all topics or just ones like Liberal/Labour reforms in the modern British topic where this might obviously arise?

This question stem is most closely aligned with historical issues where the candidate is being asked to assess a historical trend/development and as such may be used appropriately across a wide range of historical contexts.

Can students get a developed point in 'explain' questions if they go on to give more detail?

Yes. Please see the marking instructions on the SQA website on what answers following this structure might look like.

Your answer to [name redacted] is not the same as previous Understanding Standards and markers meetings. To achieve a balance mark candidates NEEDED to have credited KU in both factors. Has this changed?

Balance is awarded for relevant knowledge demonstrated over two factors.

3 'Explain ...' question

In the 'explain' question, do candidates need to have an introductory sentence, ie there were many reasons why...?

Most candidates do this; however, it is not required for candidates to access the full range of marks.

Do you have to expand in the 'explain' question, as in '... this meant/this caused ...'?

Candidates should demonstrate the skill required; historical reasons for an event, development, action and/or attitude that are relevant and clearly linked to the question asked. There are many ways in which candidates can demonstrate this skill, which are exemplified in the webinar. Two common strategies include firstly, linking back to the question then giving a historical reason and secondly, giving a historical fact then explaining it with reference to the question.

In the 'explain' question can they gain the full marks if they don't say 'another reason why some Scots were forced to emigrate was...' every time and just say 'another reason was ...'?

Please see the previous answer.

Can students get a developed point in 'explain' questions if they go on to give more detail?

Yes. Please see the marking instructions on the SQA website on what answers following this structure might look like.

Candidate can develop reasons in 'explain' questions can't they? Don't think I saw any examples of developed points?

Yes. Most candidates tend to give single historical reasons rather than developed points.

Can we cover what due process is acceptable and is required to give marks in the 'explain' question?

Candidates should demonstrate the skill required; historical reasons for an event, development, action and/or attitude that are relevant and clearly linked to the question asked. There are many ways in which candidates can demonstrate this skill, which are exemplified in the webinar. Two common strategies include firstly, linking back to the question then giving a historical reason and secondly, giving a historical fact then explaining it with reference to the question.

4 General

For the 'evaluate the usefulness' question, must a candidate quote and say the source is useful as it is accurate, or could they quote and explain the quote and still gain the mark?

Candidates should demonstrate the skill required, which is evaluation of the source. Explanation is not the same as evaluation. Examples of how candidates might demonstrate this skill are exemplified in the webinar slides.

Can we see other people's questions, so we aren't asking it multiple times?

The purpose of this webinar is to provide support and reassurance for the practitioner community in understanding standards. For this reason, we would not wish to restrict or inhibit anyone in the asking of questions within the scope of this webinar.

Can we get clarification that generic recall is acceptable for the first section of the Great War topic? Life in the trenches was difficult for numerous Scots, example.

Candidates should demonstrate knowledge that is relevant to the Scottish historical context. This knowledge can be specific local or national examples or evidence that accurately reflects the historical record. At National 5, it is not necessary to preface every valid historical point with 'Scottish'. Practitioners should use their professional knowledge in determining whether a candidate response meets the assessment standard as outlined. The example given by the questioner is a statement, not a historical fact demonstrating the difficulties of life in the trenches, and therefore would not be credited.

Scottish soldiers in the trenches. Is it okay to say that Scottish soldiers suffered trench foot in the trenches and that it doesn't need to be so specific, eg Robert McDuff from the highland infantry said there was 300 men suffering trench foot.

Please see the previous answer.