



Questions & Answers

Advanced Higher History question paper

When writing an introduction, in order to get into the 18 and over mark category, do candidates have to mention what historians' views are on the issue as well as providing context, factors to be addressed and line of argument?

While the marking grid does not specify naming historians, candidates can find it helpful to do so in order to focus on the differing debates and viewpoints. This is, of course, not the same for all topic issues within each of the 10 fields of study offered, and that is taken into account. Indeed, the fields of study have different types of history and again that is taken into account. The historical debate can therefore be covered without names.

Can I just confirm from the mark scheme, 5 marks are available for provenance and interpretation combined and then 5 marks for WCD?

In the 'Evaluate the usefulness ...' question the marks are:

Rubric Provenance	3 marks (1 each for Author, Timing and Purpose)
Content Provenance	3 marks (There are 3 points in the source.)
WCD	4 marks
Historians	2 marks

Should we encourage pupils to write 'overall' statements?

In each of the three questions candidates are asked to 'evaluate usefulness', 'consider how fully' and to 'assess the extent' of differing viewpoints. In each case it would be expected that candidates would come to an overall decision. There is no mark set aside for this, but it is advised because in this way they are answering the question.

Do pupils need substantial quotes or are shorter ones okay for source question answers?

Quoting the point in the source is a good way for candidates to read again what they are selecting. It is not required to write out the entire quote but the exact parts which are about to be analysed should be selected. As with the South Africa example, some candidates can paraphrase well and still gain the marks. Precision in both methods is the aim.

I have candidates who, in tackling the overall viewpoint comment, provide a summary of the ideas in the source. This means that when they come to interpret detailed content, they are returning, in a bit more detail, to ideas that they've already identified in overview. Is this acceptable?

Yes, this is acceptable. My only comment here is that a summary and then a detailed working will eat into the time the candidate has, but if they find it a better method and can manage this in the time then it is fine.

Please can you remind us what CADHY stands for?

In the introduction to essays I have invented this mnemonic.

Context	of this particular question
Areas	selected by writer to be discussed
Debate(s)	which surround the issue and topic asked of the question
Historians	schools of thinking or particular historians associated with the debate
Your line	of argument where you state your answer to the question

Just wondered about ETU provenance: if they say two comments re: authorship, ie 'it's useful because ... but also less useful because', this could be 2 marks?

In the 'Evaluate the usefulness' question the Rubric Provenance comments have 1 mark each. In the example you suggest candidates would not get 2 marks for authorship as only 1 mark is available.

In terms of Historiography can candidates use schools of thought rather than direct quotes?

Yes, they can but beware of using 'revisionist' without explaining what that school of historians thinks about the issue/topic asked. That would be considered a vague reference.

WCD doesn't have to be related back to the question if it's linked to the source interpretation?

The candidate should link the quote/interpretation to the question and the WCD should reinforce the interpretation about the question they have just made.