

Commentary on candidate evidence

Evaluate the usefulness question

Exemplar 1

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because the answer gives clear provenance and recall but does not evaluate source content.

Marks awarded:

- ◆ AUT awarded for ‘modern historian...useful as ... expert’
- ◆ TIM awarded for ‘written in 2008...useful as ... has the benefit of hindsight.’
- ◆ R5 awarded for ‘the source fails to mention that Scots set up their own communities...and named places in their new communities after places in Scotland.’
- ◆ DP R5 awarded for, ‘For example, Nova Scotia...’
- ◆ The developed point was awarded as it gives an example which develops the point already made.

Marks not awarded for:

- ◆ ‘The source was written to inform...’ – no evaluation
- ◆ ‘The source states “John Ewing set up...”’ – no evaluation
- ◆ ‘The source states “the Burt Brothers...”’ – no evaluation

Exemplar 2

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because the candidate evaluates the extent to which the source is useful in terms of type, authorship, timing and source content.

Marks awarded for:

- ◆ TYP – textbook/useful/educate
- ◆ AUT – historian/useful/expert
- ◆ TIM – 2009/useful/hindsight
- ◆ S3 – Valance’s men quote/useful/true to my knowledge
- ◆ S2 – Valance captured quote/useful/true to my knowledge

For the source points, the candidate is credited for explaining the accuracy of the source points and shows good practice in supporting the evaluation with additional information.

Exemplar 3

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because the response highlights good provenance comments, but also contains comments where marks are not awarded. It exemplifies the consequences of not focusing on what the question is asking.

Marks awarded:

- ◆ AUT awarded for the knowledge of the author on the topic.
- ◆ TYP awarded for the comment on the textbook – note that the candidate is discussing the purpose of the textbook and not the purpose of the source.
- ◆ R5 awarded

Marks not awarded for:

- ◆ the timing as the response is generic
- ◆ the point on the causes of the rent strikes is irrelevant as the question is not asking about causes.

How fully questions

Exemplar 1

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because this answer gives good examples of paraphrasing successfully to the standard threshold, but also highlights the dangers of not using full sentence quotes. The source also highlights that a how fully judgement can appear anywhere in the response.

Marks awarded:

- ◆ S1 awarded for the first point made on foreign competition.
- ◆ S4 awarded for the point on the lack of modernisation.
- ◆ Judgement in the next sentence 'However, source C doesn't mention...'
- ◆ R8 awarded for the point about the decline of the fishing industry.
- ◆ R5 awarded for the point on the shipbuilding industry.
- ◆ R7 awarded for the point on the jute industry.
- ◆ The candidate response ends with another judgement.

The second point was not awarded a mark as no reason is given.

Exemplar 2

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because the judgement is clear at the beginning of the response and the candidate provides one relevant source point with interpretation as well as three relevant and clearly described points of recall.

There are more attempts at source point interpretations, however, the candidate is not successful because the quotes chosen are irrelevant to the question issue (slave experience in slave factories).

Marks awarded:

- ◆ S4 – slaves chained up
- ◆ Judgement: 'However, the source is less descriptive as it fails to mention ...'
- ◆ R11 – slaves held close/disease spread
- ◆ R9 – food
- ◆ R11 – families broken up.

Exemplar 3

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because the candidate makes a judgement, accurately quotes and interprets three source points, and adds one point of recall which is explained.

Marks awarded:

- ◆ J awarded for first sentence.
- ◆ S3 awarded for quote and interpretation that farming was a growing industry in Canada.
- ◆ S1 awarded for quote and interpretation that lots of people were moving to Canada.
- ◆ S2 awarded for quote and interpretation that they wrote letters to people to join them.
- ◆ R11 awarded for 'The source fails to mention that many people emigrated for trading...jute, tea, and sugar.'

Marks were not awarded for:

- ◆ 'The source fails to mention that many went over for education...like the McGill University in Canada' – this is an impact of emigration, not a reason.
- ◆ 'The source fails to mention that many Scots immigrated to work in positions of power...the first Prime Minister in Australia was Scottish' – this is an impact, not a reason, and the point is inaccurate.

Compare questions

Exemplar 1

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because the first attempt at a comparison does not provide matching points. A subsequent attempt at a simple comparison does not relate well to the question. The second attempt at a comparison successfully matches points from each source and summarises the meaning of the matching points, so is therefore awarded marks for a developed comparison.

Marks awarded:

- ◆ DC2 – women as leaders
- ◆ OC – ‘disagree about Scottish attitudes to Margaret becoming Scotland’s queen’

Exemplar 2

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** as an overall comparison and three developed comparisons were made.

Marks awarded:

- ◆ OA awarded for ‘Sources A and B disagree about why Lithuanians settled in Scotland’.
- ◆ DC 1 awarded for ‘these sources both disagree about the reasons why Lithuanians came to Scotland’ with quotes.
- ◆ DC 3 awarded for ‘the sources disagree about the amount of Lithuanians coming to Scotland’ with quotes.
- ◆ SC 2 awarded for ‘these sources disagree about what Lithuanians did in Scotland’ with quotes.

Exemplar 3

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for an overall comparison.

Marks awarded:

- ◆ OC awarded for ‘Sources A and B disagree about military tactics on the Western Front’.

Marks not awarded:

- ◆ The candidate is not awarded marks for the first attempt at a developed comparison, as the simple comparison talks about attitudes, not military tactics. The candidate is not awarded a simple comparison mark for the disagreement of the quotes from the sources as the candidate does not copy out the full sentence from Source A and thus misses out the subject of the sentence – having no cover.

- ◆ The candidate is not awarded marks for the second attempt at a developed comparison as there is no comparative language use, eg 'disagree'.

Explain questions

Exemplar 1

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because there were issues with the accuracy and detail of the reasons given.

Marks awarded/not awarded for:

- ◆ Confusion in the first point means it cannot gain credit (Saladin uniting the Muslims was a problem).
- ◆ The point on the problem of the succession of Baldwin credited. (MI 9)
- ◆ Crusader army not being ready was not credited. There was an army, though it was small and under constant attack. This is not mentioned by the candidate.
- ◆ Final repetition and general points were made about Baldwin – these did not gain credit.

Exemplar 2

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because the candidate gives two reasons explaining why some people became conscientious objectors.

Marks awarded:

- ◆ R2 awarded for the explanation about religious beliefs.
- ◆ R1 awarded for the explanation on moral beliefs.

Exemplar 3

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** because the candidate provided six relevant reasons.

Marks awarded:

- ◆ R2 awarded for 'One reason ... Quakers'
- ◆ R1 awarded for 'Another reason ... another man.'
- ◆ R7 awarded for 'Another reason ... went to war.'
- ◆ R6 awarded for 'Another reason ... extremely anti-monarchy.'
- ◆ R10 awarded for 'Another reason ... and refused to go.'
- ◆ R9 awarded for 'Another reason ... the liberty of choice.'

Exemplar 4

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** because the candidate provides six explained reasons, five of which were awarded the mark.

Marks awarded:

- ◆ MI 1 awarded for '6 million people out of employment.'

- ◆ MI 9 awarded for 'schemes to buy the people's car'
- ◆ MI 2 awarded for 'what it was like in the kaiser's time'
- ◆ MI 8 awarded for 'rebuild the army and break the rules that the treaty made.'
- ◆ DP MI 8 awarded for 'took back land... get German speaking people back in Germany' (This could also be awarded as MI 9.)

Marks not awarded:

- ◆ A mark was not awarded for 'created a work plan...days off as a holiday' – The candidate may be attempting to explain Strength through Joy, but the way in which this point is expressed is too vague.

9-mark essay

Exemplar 1

The candidate was awarded **9 marks** because the candidate provides relevant recalled knowledge to provide a balanced answer and arrives at a reasoned conclusion.

Marks awarded:

- ◆ Introduction
I: factors
- ◆ Factor 1
R: army opened fire
R1 DP: betrayed by Tsar
- ◆ Factor 2
BALANCE and R13: housing conditions
R13 DP: housing
R13: working long hours
- ◆ Conclusion
J: discontent of peasants and workers
SR: unhappy for a long time

Exemplar 2

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because the response is organised, with easily identified skills demonstrated. However, the answer is incomplete, and the conclusion is confused with no judgement.

Marks awarded:

- ◆ I awarded for first paragraph – provides context and factors.
- ◆ MI 5 awarded for ‘no young, fit and strong people...cultivate land.’
- ◆ BALANCE and MI 9 awarded for ‘many people dying due to fighting tribes’ (Again candidate has not used a separate paragraph but this evidence does introduce a new factor.)
- ◆ MI 10 awarded for ‘many tribes were at war with each other...defend themselves from other tribes in Africa.’

Exemplar 3

The candidate was awarded **7 marks** because the candidate provides a concise but structured response, gaining 3 knowledge and understanding marks and 4 structure marks.

Marks awarded:

- ◆ Introduction
Mark credited for the identification of two factors.
- ◆ Factor 1
Religious comments on religious motivations credited (MI 1).
- ◆ Factor 2
Comment about power (unification of churches) credited. (MI 7). This leads to balance being credited. Again, even though this is contained within one paragraph, two factors can be credited.
Threat to Christian cities credited (MI 2).
- ◆ Conclusion
Clear judgement and supporting reason credited.

Exemplar 4

The candidate was awarded **7 marks** because the candidate demonstrates the necessary evidence to achieve marks for an introduction, 3 knowledge points, balance, judgement and supporting reason.

- ◆ Introduction
I awarded for 'the activities of the Ku Klux Klan ... in the north.' The candidate outlines relevant factors.
- ◆ Factor 1
R2 awarded for 'The Ku Klux Klan were ... community.'
- ◆ Factor 2
R10 awarded for 'desegregation was ... facilities'
BALANCE awarded as knowledge is being organised in support of different factors.
- ◆ Factor 3
R10 awarded for 'the growth of culture ... proud to be black'
- ◆ Conclusion
J awarded for 'the most important reason for ...KKK'
SR awarded for 'it made black Americans ... they were active.'

Describe questions

Exemplar 1

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because the candidate demonstrates five very clear points of knowledge.

Marks awarded:

- ◆ R5 awarded for the intimidation and fear caused by tanks.
- ◆ R2 awarded for the cover tanks provided.
- ◆ R9 awarded for the use of weapons on tanks.
- ◆ R8 awarded for tanks breaking down.
- ◆ R3 awarded for the ability of tanks to cross rough terrain.

Exemplar 2

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because the candidate demonstrates five factual points.

Marks awarded:

- ◆ R4 awarded for 'horrific overcrowding and poor housing in the slums of cities'.
- ◆ R9 awarded for 'immigrants faced the discrimination from older immigrant groups known as WASPs'.
- ◆ R2 awarded for 'faced harmful stereotypes ... a job/education.'
- ◆ R9 awarded for 'immigrants faced poor or no access to healthcare'.
- ◆ R9 awarded for 'they lived so close ... in these communities'.

Exemplar 3

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because the candidate provided two clear points of knowledge

Marks awarded:

- ◆ MI 1 awarded for 'North Korea were trying...they wanted the South to be as well.'
- ◆ MI 9 awarded for 'This ... led to America getting involved in the war'.