

Advanced Higher History Question Paper

Part A — HISTORICAL ISSUES — 50 marks
25 mark (extended response/essay) question

What is required in an extended response at Advanced Higher?

- ◆ Knowledge
- ◆ Analysis
- ◆ Evaluation
- ◆ Historians' views
- ◆ Synthesis/line of argument
- ◆ Reasoned conclusion

What is required in an extended response at Advanced Higher?

In other words:

- ◆ A response that answers the question.
- ◆ Engagement with the isolated factor or issue in the question.
- ◆ A clear structure.
- ◆ An introduction that shows an understanding of the issue and sets it in its wider context.
- ◆ Analysis and evaluation combined with detail.
- ◆ Use of historians' views to develop arguments.
- ◆ A sustained line of argument.
- ◆ Reasoned conclusion(s) with candidate's own views not synopsis of views of current historians.

Historiography

At Advanced Higher level there **MUST** be some recognition of different historical interpretations. Extended responses should show evidence of reading and **an awareness that there are different views on an issue.**

“Historians have argued ...” minimum for meeting the C standard.

A ‘B’ and ‘A’ (Historical sources/Interpretations) extended response may

- ◆ accurately quote historians by name
- ◆ refer to particular schools of thought
- ◆ give quotes from historians and changing views over time

The extended response/essay question

Remember, candidates shouldn't:

- ignore the isolated factor
- write too short an answer
- forget to include historian's interpretations.

Responses without recognition of different historical interpretations will not be awarded more than 12 marks.

- ◆ “Other historians have argued ...” minimum for meeting the C standard.

How are the 25 mark questions marked?

□ General Marking Principles

<http://www.sqa.org.uk/sqa/48466.html>



Advice and guidance

Course and Unit Support Notes

Specimen Question Paper and Marking Instructions

Coursework information

Submitting Coursework

Unit Assessment Support

Understanding Standards materials

Verification and Course Reports

How are the 25 mark questions marked?

- ❑ Detailed Marking Instructions for each question giving intention of the question, examples of relevant content and Historians' Perspectives

Advanced Higher History **Marking Instructions**
SECTION 7 — Germany: from Democracy to Dictatorship, 1918–1939



Question 49

How valid is the view that there was nothing more than a revolutionary situation in Germany in 1918–1919?

Aim of the question

The aim of this essay is to allow candidates to discuss the nature of what historians call the German Revolution. Candidates could opt to discuss the extent to which there was a revolutionary situation rather than merely war weariness and the degree of change during 1918–19, and whether or not the degree of change merits the label “revolution”. Or they could opt to weigh up aspects of change 1918–19 against one another before drawing conclusions about the German Revolution.

A revolutionary situation in 1918–19 but not a revolution

Prince Max attempted to preserve the old regime as far as possible

- Max von Baden’s October Reforms had changed Germany from a military dictatorship into a parliamentary monarchy.
- The October reforms were not enough to stop popular unrest as expressed in mutinies at Kiel and Wilhelmshaven, strikes, riots and the setting up of soviets across the country.

Historians Perspective on the issue

William Carr

Takes the view that the achievements of the revolution were undoubtedly limited. The structure of Germany was hardly affected by the revolution. The spirit of Imperial Germany lived on in the unreformed civil service, the judiciary and the officer corps. Nor did the powerful industrial barons have much to fear from the revolution.

Ruth Henig

Takes the view that the revolution did not result in the wholesale removal of the existing economic or social structures. A Marxist revolution had been prevented and the forces of reaction and strident nationalism made a swift recovery and emerged by 1920 as the most potent enemies of the new republic.

Eberhard Kolb

Takes the view that the revolutionary mass movement was essentially a failure, both in its moderate phase and in its second radical phase. One can speak of “a revolution that ran aground, and one with which none of the main political groups wished to be identified. Scarcely anyone in Germany had wanted the revolution to develop and come to stop in the way it did.”

How are the 25 mark questions marked?

- ❑ Detailed Marking Instructions (Grid) describing typical features/qualities

Four criteria

- 1) Structure
- 2) Analysis/evaluation/line of argument
- 3) Thoroughness/relevance of information and approach
- 4) Historical sources/interpretations

25 mark questions – mark ranges and individual marking criteria

		Mark ranges						
		0-9	10-12	13-14	15-17	18-19	20-22	23-25
Marking criteria	Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no relevant functional introduction • no separate sections which relate to relevant factors • no conclusion which makes an overall judgement on the issue 	An attempt to structure the essay, seen in at least one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relevant functional introduction • separate sections which relate to relevant factors • conclusion which makes an overall judgement on the issue 	The structure displays a basic organisation but this may be loose. This would refer to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relevant functional introduction • separate sections which relate to relevant factors • conclusion which makes an overall judgement on the issue 	The structure is readily apparent with a competent presentation of the issues. This would include each of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relevant functional introduction • separate sections which relate to relevant factors • conclusion which makes an overall judgement on the issue 	Clearly structured, perceptive, presentation of issues. This would include each of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relevant functional introduction setting out main interpretations • separate sections which relate to relevant factors • conclusion which makes an overall judgement on the issue 	Clearly structured, perceptive presentation of issues. Structured so that the argument clearly develops throughout the response. This would include each of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relevant functional introduction setting out main interpretations • separate sections which relate to relevant factors • conclusion which makes an overall judgement on the issue 	
	Marking criteria	Analysis/evaluation/line of argument	No evidence of analysis Or Analysis is not relevant to the question	There is much narrative and description rather than analysis or evaluation There is a weak sense of argument	There is an attempt to answer the evaluative aims of the question and analyse the issues involved, although this is possibly not deep or sustained; the analysis includes relevant isolated factor Argument is generally clear and accurate but there may be confusions	There is a firm grasp of the evaluative aims of the question and the candidate tackles it with a fairly sustained analysis Argument is clear and accurate, and comes to a suitable – largely summative – conclusion	There is a firm grasp of the evaluative aims of the question and an assured and consistent control of the arguments and issues The conclusion arises logically from the evidence and arguments in the main body, and attempts synthesis	Fluent and insightful presentation of the issues There is a firm grasp of the evaluative aims of the question and a very assured and consistent control of all the arguments and issues The conclusion gives a robust overview/ synthesis and a qualitative judgement of factors

0-9	10-12	13-14	15-17	18-19	20-22 23-25
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ no relevant functional introduction ◆ no separate sections which relate to relevant factors ◆ no conclusion which makes an overall judgement on the issue 	<p>An attempt to structure the essay, seen in at least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ relevant functional introduction ◆ separate sections which relate to relevant factors ◆ conclusion which makes an overall judgement on the issue 	<p>The structure displays a basic organisation but this may be loose.</p> <p>This would refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ relevant functional introduction ◆ separate sections which relate to relevant factors ◆ conclusion which makes an overall judgement on the issue 	<p>The structure is readily apparent with a competent presentation of the issues.</p> <p>This would include each of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ relevant functional introduction ◆ separate sections which relate to relevant factors ◆ conclusion which makes an overall judgement on the issue 	<p>Clearly structured, perceptive, presentation of issues.</p> <p>This would include each of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ relevant functional introduction setting out main interpretations ◆ separate sections which relate to relevant factors ◆ conclusion which makes an overall judgement on the issue 	<p>Clearly structured, perceptive presentation of issues. Structured so that the argument clearly develops throughout the response.</p> <p>This would include each of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ relevant functional introduction setting out main interpretations ◆ separate sections which relate to relevant factors ◆ conclusion which makes an overall judgement on the issue

0-9	10-12	13-14	15-17	18-19	20-22
<p>No evidence of analysis</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Analysis is not relevant to the question</p>	<p>There is much narrative and description rather than analysis or evaluation</p> <p>There is a weak sense of argument</p>	<p>There is an attempt to answer the evaluative aims of the question and analyse the issues involved, although this is possibly not deep or sustained. The analysis includes relevant isolated factor.</p> <p>Argument is generally clear and accurate but there may be confusions</p>	<p>There is a firm grasp of the evaluative aims of the question and the candidate tackles it with a fairly sustained analysis</p> <p>Argument is clear and accurate, and comes to a suitable — largely summative — conclusion</p>	<p>There is a firm grasp of the evaluative aims of the question and an assured and consistent control of the arguments and issues</p> <p>The conclusion arises logically from the evidence and arguments in the main body, and attempts synthesis</p>	<p>Fluent and insightful presentation of the issues</p> <p>There is a firm grasp of the evaluative aims of the question and a very assured and consistent control of all the arguments and issues</p> <p>The conclusion gives a robust overview/ synthesis and a qualitative judgement of factors</p>

Historical sources/Interpretations

0-9	10-12	13-14	15-17	18-19	20-22
<p>No discernible reference to historical works</p>	<p>No discernible reference to historical works</p>	<p>There is some awareness of historians' interpretations in relation to the issue</p> <p>Historians may be used as illustrative points of knowledge</p>	<p>There is an awareness of historians' interpretations and arguments</p> <p>Historians may be used as illustrative point of main lines of interpretation</p>	<p>There is a sound knowledge and understanding of historians' interpretations and arguments</p> <p>There is some awareness of possible variations of these interpretations or connections between them</p>	<p>There is a sound and consistent knowledge and understanding of historians' interpretations and arguments</p> <p>There is some awareness of possible variations of these interpretations or connections between them. There may be an appreciation of the context which gives rise to these interpretations.</p>

Thoroughness/relevance of information
and approach

0-9	10-12	13-14	15-17	18-19	20-22
<p>No evidence of relevant knowledge of the issue</p>	<p>Treatment of the issue shows little relevant knowledge</p> <p>Some elements of the factual content and approach relate only very loosely to the issue</p>	<p>Treatment of the issue shows sufficient knowledge which reflects a basic understanding of the issue</p>	<p>Treatment of the issue shows an awareness of the width and depth of the knowledge required for a study of the issue</p>	<p>Treatment of the issue is based on a fair quantity of research, demonstrating width and depth of knowledge</p> <p>Points of evidence are linked to points of analysis or evaluation</p>	<p>Treatment of the issue is based on wide research and demonstrates a considerable width and depth of knowledge</p> <p>Points of evidence are linked to points of analysis or evaluation</p>