

**2004 HSC Notes from
the Marking Centre
Modern History**

© 2005 Copyright Board of Studies NSW for and on behalf of the Crown in right of the State of New South Wales.

This document contains Material prepared by the Board of Studies NSW for and on behalf of the State of New South Wales. The Material is protected by Crown copyright.

All rights reserved. No part of the Material may be reproduced in Australia or in any other country by any process, electronic or otherwise, in any material form or transmitted to any other person or stored electronically in any form without the prior written permission of the Board of Studies NSW, except as permitted by the *Copyright Act 1968*. School candidates in NSW and teachers in schools in NSW may copy reasonable portions of the Material for the purposes of bona fide research or study.

When you access the Material you agree:

- to use the Material for information purposes only
- to reproduce a single copy for personal bona fide study use only and not to reproduce any major extract or the entire Material without the prior permission of the Board of Studies NSW
- to acknowledge that the Material is provided by the Board of Studies NSW
- not to make any charge for providing the Material or any part of the Material to another person or in any way make commercial use of the Material without the prior written consent of the Board of Studies NSW and payment of the appropriate copyright fee
- to include this copyright notice in any copy made
- not to modify the Material or any part of the Material without the express prior written permission of the Board of Studies NSW.

The Material may contain third party copyright materials such as photos, diagrams, quotations, cartoons and artworks. These materials are protected by Australian and international copyright laws and may not be reproduced or transmitted in any format without the copyright owner's specific permission. Unauthorised reproduction, transmission or commercial use of such copyright materials may result in prosecution.

The Board of Studies has made all reasonable attempts to locate owners of third party copyright material and invites anyone from whom permission has not been sought to contact the Copyright Officer, ph (02) 9367 8289, fax (02) 9279 1482.

Published by Board of Studies NSW
GPO Box 5300
Sydney 2001
Australia

Tel: (02) 9367 8111

Fax: (02) 9367 8484

Internet: <http://www.boardofstudies.nsw.edu.au>

ISBN 1 7414 7191 5

2005009

Contents

Section I – Core Study – World War I (30 Marks).....	5
Section II – National Study (20 Marks).....	6
Section II – National Studies – Personality (20 Marks).....	8
Section III – International Studies in Peace and Conflict (30 Marks)	10

2004 HSC NOTES FROM THE MARKING CENTRE

MODERN HISTORY

Introduction

This document has been produced for the teachers and candidates of the Stage 6 course in Modern History. It provides comments with regard to responses to the 2004 Higher School Certificate Examination, indicating the quality of candidate responses and highlighting the relative strengths and weaknesses of the candidature in each section and each question.

It is essential for this document to be read in conjunction with the relevant syllabus, the 2004 Higher School Certificate Examination, the Marking Guidelines and other support documents which have been developed by the Board of Studies to assist in the teaching and learning of Modern History.

General Comments

9300 candidates sat the Modern History paper in 2004. This was a slight increase on 2003.

There was a decline from previous years in the number of problem scripts, that is, the number of candidates attempting incorrect combinations of questions.

Better responses provided sustained arguments, analysing in depth on the basis of detailed knowledge. These candidates focused on the questions and used supporting evidence well.

Average responses had difficulty focusing on the relevant issues or spoke in general terms about the issue. Weaker responses often simply wrote about the events of the period without linking them to the question. Candidates all too frequently ignored the time periods defined in the question and wrote what they knew about the topic.

Section I – Core Study – World War I (30 Marks)

Questions 1, 2 and 3

Candidates found the questions accessible and the sources gave them considerable information to write about.

It was pleasing to see that more candidates now realise they can obtain maximum marks by writing within the space provided in the answer booklet.

Specific Comments

Question 1

Candidates generally had no problems with the questions with 95% scoring in the top marking range. The nature of the sources and the questions asked gave candidates clear direction of what was expected of them.

Most marks were lost in part (c) due to an inability to identify knowledge from Source A that explains the attitude described in Source B.

Question 2

Candidates were clear about what the question expected of them. The sources covered many aspects. Many candidates tended to rely too heavily on these sources. The weaker responses often merely paraphrased the sources.

In the better responses candidates used more of their own knowledge and linked this knowledge to the sources. The very best responses included information about the goals of the ‘Big Three’ that was not mentioned in the sources.

While specific reference to sources is recommended, candidates should not quote large sections of the sources in their answers.

Candidates who wrote better responses did not write separate paragraphs on each of the ‘Big Three.’ They integrated each of the three in making their point and did not write lengthy introductions that merely restated the question.

Question 3

This question proved to be the discriminator in this section. Many candidates still were unable to distinguish between useful and reliable; often they would merely interchange the two.

Reliability was often not understood by weaker candidates and as such they ignored it, concentrating on the content of the sources.

Better candidates gave perspective more than just a passing mention. They were able to establish a context for the sources, placing them into the period of the war in which they were written, ie Source C late in the war, Source D early in the war.

Few candidates saw Source D as being from the perspective of a left wing socialist publication. Too many dismissed Source D as biased and therefore unreliable.

Section II – National Study (20 Marks)

(Questions 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18)

General Comments

Most candidates were able to display their knowledge about the National Study and wrote answers of good length. Some candidates needed to focus more directly on the issues raised in the question. The better responses analysed the key events, groups and concepts with detailed knowledge to provide a sustained response.

Percentage of Candidates Attempting Options

In the National Studies the popularity of options was very similar to 2003.

Germany 65%

Russia 21%

USA 8%

China 3%

India/Japan/Australia/Indonesia – less than 3% in total

Specific Comments

Question 4

USA: 26% attempted 4 (a) and 74% attempted 4 (b)

- (a) The basic responses successfully linked the victory in the Spanish-American War with the development of an expansionist foreign policy over the next two decades. There appeared to be some confusion about the US policy of isolationism and how that related to expansionist foreign policy. The poorer responses tended to talk at length about Westward expansion and included a lot of information outside the time period.
- (b) This question was the more popular question. It tended to require a broad response with candidates finding it challenging to cover the growth of conservatism and its impact on both society and politics in both the 1920s and 1930s. The poorer answers tended to run through the events of the 1920s and dealt with the New Deal legislation as an example of conservatism in the 1930s.

Question 10

Russia: 82% attempted 10 (a) and 18% attempted 10 (b)

- (a) This question was generally answered well with most candidates understanding 'Modernisation'. More able candidates integrated the debate on modernisation into the struggle for power. Many candidates also discussed the process of modernisation in the late 1920s and 1930s. Less able candidates were content with a narrative of events during the struggle for power.
- (b) This question was answered by fewer candidates. Some candidates became confused by the term Great Patriotic War and wrote about the Civil War or even World War 1. Better responses examined the changes in society and Stalinist communism, while weaker responses simply narrated the events of the war.

Question 12

Germany: 90% attempted 12 (a) and 10% attempted 12 (b)

- (a) Better responses presented an integrated response balancing the appeal of the Nazis and the collapse of Weimar. These candidates saw the Nazis as being able to gain benefit from a struggling Weimar Republic. Other candidates tended to say that the Nazi appeal was important but there were other reasons and then just focus on the collapse of Weimar. Weaker responses generally gave a prepared answer on the fall of Weimar.
- (b) Although done by fewer candidates many had a good knowledge of the collapse of Nazism and better responses showed how the Battle of Stalingrad was a turning point, linking this to other military defeats and the impact on the German home front.

Japan: 68% attempted (a) and 32% attempted (b)

China: 57% attempted (a) and 43% attempted (b)

India: 62% attempted (a) and 38% attempted (b)

Australia: 90% attempted (a) and 10% attempted (b)

Indonesia: 95% attempted (a) and 5% attempted (b)

Section II – National Studies – Personality (20 Marks)

(Questions 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19)

General Comments

Overall the ‘personality’ questions were well answered by candidates. A continuing problem is that candidates are still spending a disproportionate time answering the first question and giving little time to the second question despite their equal value. Some candidates ignored the time periods given and spent unnecessary time especially in the lead up or by going beyond the specified period.

Fewer candidates answered the two questions together as one response. Candidates need to be reminded that they are separate questions requiring separate responses. While markers did not penalise candidates for this approach, candidates are doing themselves a disservice, as they do not adequately cover the issues raised in the two questions. Some candidates also wrote a timeline list of events for the first question. This approach is to be discouraged as a descriptive narration is expected, as indicated in the rubric for this section.

Question 5

USA: 15% attempted Hearst and 85% attempted Hoover

- (a) (i) Better responses gave a chronological account without going into irrelevant material. Weaker responses tended to be indiscriminating in the selection of events.
- (ii) Better responses referred directly to the statements using them as essential background for their answer while weaker responses may have referred to the statement but concentrated solely on discussing the question in isolation.

With regard to the Hearst question many candidates found difficulty in confining themselves to the interwar period of the statement. In the Hoover question there was some confusion as to what constituted ‘organised crime’.

Question 7

Japan: 62% attempted Hirohito and 38% attempted Ikki

Question 9

China: 56% attempted Sun Yixian and 44% attempted Zhu De

Question 11

Russia: 13% attempted Kollontai and 87% attempted Trotsky

- (a) (i) Better answers gave a comprehensive coverage of key events and outlined their significance within the specified time-frame. Poorer answers presented a sequence of events lacking in

depth or description as to why the events were significant in Kollontai's life. They also wandered outside the specified time-frame.

- (ii) Better answers were able to link her political beliefs and ideology with her reforms and make a critical judgement about her role. Poorer answers tended to list reforms without assessing Kollontai's role in them.
- (b) (i) Better answers gave a comprehensive coverage of key events and outlined their significance within the specified time-frame. Poorer answers presented a sequence of events lacking in depth or description as to why the events were significant in Trotsky's life. They also wandered outside the specified time-frame.
- (ii) Better answers made a clear and sustained judgement about the conflict between Trotsky's ideology and his practical revolutionary role. Poorer answers didn't understand the concept of socialist idealism and merely presented a chronological list of Trotsky's participation in specified events.

Question 13

Germany: 42% attempted Riefenstahl and 58% attempted Speer

- (a) (i) Better answers gave a comprehensive selection of key events and outlined their significance. Poorer answers just sequenced events with no depth or discussion as to why events were significant. Many answers also provided information outside the specified time period.
- (ii) Better answers showed that they understood the statement and presented a case to support this. They were also able to show the link between propaganda and documentary history. Poorer answers ignored 'documentary history' and focused on a prepared answer about art versus propaganda.
- (b) (i) Better answers gave a comprehensive selection of key events and outlined their significance. Poorer answers just sequenced events with no depth or discussion as to why events were significant. Many answers also provided information outside the specified time period.
- (ii) Better answers showed an understanding of the concept of 'war machine' and dealt with the statement and were able to make a judgement on Speer's role as a committed Nazi. Poorer answers failed to deal with the statement and limited their response to a narrative of what Speer did during the war.

Question 15

India: 10% attempted Nehru and 90% attempted Jinnah

Question 17

Australia: 94% attempted Evatt and 6% attempted Fraser

Question 19

Indonesia: 61% attempted Toer and 39% attempted Sukarno

Section III – International Studies in Peace and Conflict (30 Marks)

(Questions 20–26)

General Comments

Most candidates wrote longer responses than previous years and demonstrated good knowledge of the topic areas. However the more able candidates could focus directly on the key issues in the question being asked and could analyse them effectively. Better responses also used historiography in their argument and were able to benefit from this.

Percentage of candidates attempting Options

Conflict in Indochina 1954–1979	36 %
The Cold War 1945–1991	27 %
Arab–Israel Conflict 1948–1996	15 %
Conflict in the Pacific 1937–1951	14 %
Anglo-Irish Relations 1968–1998	4 %
Conflict in South Africa 1947–1994	3 %
The United Nations as Peacekeeper 1946–1999	1 %

Question 20

Conflict in the Pacific: 43% attempted 20 (a) and 57% attempted 20 (b)

- (a) Better answers argued the extent to which nationalism was a cause in some depth as well as factors such as economic imperialism, racism and the demand for raw materials and resources. Weaker answers only described key features such as Japanese expansionism and the attack on Pearl Harbor.
- (b) The best responses did more than just argue the case for the use of the A-bomb. They integrated the tactics and ethos of the Japanese armed forces and other factors such as Cold War perspectives into their argument. Weaker responses described prisoners of war and kamikaze attacks and linked these to the US use of the A-bomb.

Question 21

The Cold War: 69% attempted 21 (a) and 31% attempted 21 (b)

- (a) Most candidates identified the ideological differences but then narrated events from 1945 to 1953. Better answers were able to link the issue of ideology to the actual events.
- (b) Most candidates tended to explain why detente came to an end. Better answers identified its aims and showed its purpose was never to end the Cold War in the first place.

Many candidates had only prepared one ‘crisis’, often Cuba, and wrote about this in desperation trying to make it relevant to the question. Those whose crisis was Berlin, Korea, Angola or Afghanistan at least had some relevant factual material.

Question 22

The United Nations as Peacekeeper: 80% attempted 22 (a) and 20% attempted 22 (b)

Question 23

Conflict in South Africa: 57% attempted 23 (a) and 43% attempted 23 (b)

Question 24

Arab–Israel Conflict: 80% attempted 24 (a) and 20% attempted 24 (b)

- (a) This question elicited a wide range of responses with the better answers addressing the issues of terrorism, politics and peace. Many responses showed a sophisticated understanding of the impact of settlers on the political process and could identify and discuss the relevant key concepts. Teachers would be wise to expect questions on any concept and key group in the syllabus.

Question 25

Conflict in Indochina: 20% attempted 25 (a) and 80% attempted 25 (b)

- (a) Better responses considered the roles played by North Vietnam, South Vietnam and the US governments in the failure of the Geneva Peace Agreement.
- (b) The better responses argued the role played by the Vietcong in the wider context of US withdrawal from Vietnam and the eventual defeat of South Vietnamese forces in 1975. Weaker responses narrated the activities of the Vietcong with no real attempt to address the question.

Question 26

Anglo–Irish Relations: 59% attempted (a) and 41% attempted (b)

Modern History

2004 HSC Examination Mapping Grid

Question	Marks	Content	Syllabus outcomes
Section I — World War I and Its Aftermath, 1914–1921			
1 (a) (i)	1	World War I and its Aftermath	H5.1
1 (a) (ii)	1	World War I and its Aftermath	H5.1
1 (a) (iii)	1	World War I and its Aftermath	H5.1
1 (a) (iv)	1	World War I and its Aftermath	H5.1
1 (a) (v)	1	World War I and its Aftermath	H5.1
1 (b) (i)	1	World War I and its Aftermath	H5.1
1 (b) (ii)	1	World War I and its Aftermath	H5.1
1 (b) (iii)	1	World War I and its Aftermath	H5.1
1 (c)	2	World War I and its Aftermath	H1.2, H5.1
2	10	World War I and its Aftermath	H1.2, H3.1, H4.2, H5.1
3	10	World War I and its Aftermath	H4.1
Section II — National Studies			
4 (a)	20	USA 1898–1941	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
4 (b)	20	USA 1898–1941	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
5 (a) (i)	10	USA – William Randolph Hearst	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1
5 (a) (ii)	10	USA – William Randolph Hearst	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1, H6.1
5 (b) (i)	10	USA – J Edgar Hoover	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1
5 (b) (ii)	10	USA – J Edgar Hoover	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1, H6.1
6 (a)	20	Japan 1904–1941	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
6 (b)	20	Japan 1904–1941	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
7 (a) (i)	10	Japan – Emperor Hirohito	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1
7 (a) (ii)	10	Japan – Emperor Hirohito	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1, H6.1
7 (b) (i)	10	Japan – Kita Ikki	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1

Question	Marks	Content	Syllabus outcomes
7 (b) (ii)	10	Japan – Kita Ikki	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1, H6.1
8 (a)	20	China 1911–1949	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
8 (b)	20	China 1911–1949	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
9 (a) (i)	10	China – Sun Yixian (Sun Yat-sen)	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1
9 (a) (ii)	10	China – Sun Yixian (Sun Yat-sen)	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1, H6.1
9 (b) (i)	10	China – Zhu De (Chu Teh)	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1
9 (b) (ii)	10	China – Zhu De (Chu Teh)	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1, H6.1
10 (a)	20	Russia and the Soviet Union 1917–1945	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
10 (b)	20	Russia and the Soviet Union 1917–1945	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
11 (a) (i)	10	Russia – Alexandra Kollontai	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1
11 (a) (ii)	10	Russia – Alexandra Kollontai	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1, H6.1
11 (b) (i)	10	Russia – Leon Trotsky	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1
11 (b) (ii)	10	Russia – Leon Trotsky	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1, H6.1
12 (a)	20	Germany 1918–1945	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
12 (b)	20	Germany 1918–1945	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
13 (a) (i)	10	Germany – Leni Riefenstahl	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1
13 (a) (ii)	10	Germany – Leni Riefenstahl	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1, H6.1
13 (b) (i)	10	Germany – Albert Speer	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1
13 (b) (ii)	10	Germany – Albert Speer	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1, H6.1
14 (a)	20	India 1919–1947	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
14 (b)	20	India 1919–1947	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
15 (a) (i)	10	India – Jawaharlal Nehru	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1
15 (a) (ii)	10	India – Jawaharlal Nehru	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1, H6.1
15 (b) (i)	10	India – Mohammad Ali Jinnah	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1
15 (b) (ii)	10	India – Mohammad Ali Jinnah	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1, H6.1
16 (a)	20	Australia in the World 1946–1996	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1

Question	Marks	Content	Syllabus outcomes
16 (b)	20	Australia in the World 1946–1996	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
17 (a) (i)	10	Australia – Herbert Vere Evatt	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1
17 (a) (ii)	10	Australia – Herbert Vere Evatt	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1, H6.1
17 (b) (i)	10	Australia – Malcolm Fraser	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1
17 (b) (ii)	10	Australia – Malcolm Fraser	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1, H6.1
18 (a)	20	Indonesia 1950–1998	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
18 (b)	20	Indonesia 1950–1998	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
19 (a) (i)	10	Indonesia – Pramoedya Ananta Toer	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1
19 (a) (ii)	10	Indonesia – Pramoedya Ananta Toer	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1, H6.1
19 (b) (i)	10	Indonesia – Sukarno	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1
19 (b) (ii)	10	Indonesia – Sukarno	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1, H6.1
Section III — International Studies in Peace and Conflict			
20 (a)	30	Conflict in the Pacific 1937–1951	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
20 (b)	30	Conflict in the Pacific 1937–1951	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
21 (a)	30	The Cold War 1945–1991	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
21 (b)	30	The Cold War 1945–1991	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
22 (a)	30	The United Nations as Peacekeeper 1946–1999	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
22 (b)	30	The United Nations as Peacekeeper 1946–1999	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
23 (a)	30	Conflict in South Africa 1948–1994	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
23 (b)	30	Conflict in South Africa 1948–1994	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
24 (a)	30	Arab–Israel Conflict 1948–1996	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
24 (b)	30	Arab–Israel Conflict 1948–1996	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
25 (a)	30	Conflict in Indochina 1954–1979	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
25 (b)	30	Conflict in Indochina 1954–1979	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
26 (a)	30	Anglo-Irish Relations 1968–1998	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1
26 (b)	30	Anglo-Irish Relations 1968–1998	H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1

2004 HSC Modern History Marking Guidelines

Section I — World War I and Its Aftermath, 1914–1921

Question 1 (a) (i)

Outcomes assessed: H5.1

MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
• USA	1

Question 1 (a) (ii)

Outcomes assessed: H5.1

MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
• France	1

Question 1 (a) (iii)

Outcomes assessed: H5.1

MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
• Germany	1

Question 1 (a) (iv)*Outcomes assessed: H5.1***MARKING GUIDELINES**

Criteria	Marks
• France	1

Question 1 (a) (v)*Outcomes assessed: H5.1***MARKING GUIDELINES**

Criteria	Marks
• USA	1

Question 1 (b) (i)*Outcomes assessed: H5.1***MARKING GUIDELINES**

Criteria	Marks
• Clemenceau	1

Question 1 (b) (ii)*Outcomes assessed: H5.1***MARKING GUIDELINES**

Criteria	Marks
• Lloyd George	

Question 1 (b) (iii)*Outcomes assessed: H5.1***MARKING GUIDELINES**

Criteria	Marks
• Woodrow Wilson	1

Question 1 (c)*Outcomes assessed: H1.2, H5.1***MARKING GUIDELINES**

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lists TWO of<ul style="list-style-type: none">– Number of casualties/killed/wounded/absolute numbers– Percentage of casualties/killed/wounded– Destruction of farms/factories compared with other nations	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lists ONE of the above	1

Question 2*Outcomes assessed: H1.2, H3.1, H4.2, H5.1***MARKING GUIDELINES**

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provides a comprehensive account that demonstrates breadth of relevant knowledge combined with specific use of BOTH sources• Demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of the goals of the Big Three at the Paris Peace Conference	9–10
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provides some clear comparison with appropriate use of BOTH sources with reference to own relevant knowledge• Demonstrates sound knowledge of the goals of the Big Three at the Paris Peace Conference	7–8
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Uses relevant knowledge and makes specific reference to at least ONE source• Makes generalisations about the goals of the Big Three at the Paris Peace Conference	5–6
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Limited use of knowledge and sources, relying largely on simple description or narrative	3–4
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• One or two references to the goals of the Big Three at the Paris Peace Conference	1–2

Question 3*Outcomes assessed: H4.1***MARKING GUIDELINES**

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Makes a clear judgement which demonstrates a thorough understanding of BOTH sources in the context of their usefulness• Provides an effective discussion of perspective and reliability in the wider context of the question	9–10
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Makes a judgement about the usefulness of BOTH sources to the question but may be uneven in its treatment• Provides some discussion of perspective and reliability in the wider context of the question	7–8
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Attempts a discussion of the usefulness of BOTH sources to the question, with some reference to perspective and reliability OR <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provides a detailed discussion and evaluation of the usefulness of ONE source to the question and its perspective and reliability	5–6
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Generalises about the usefulness of the source(s) with few links to either reliability or perspective• May paraphrase sources	3–4
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some reference to the use of sources generally OR <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Simple description or paraphrase of one or both sources	1–2

Section II — National Studies**Questions 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18***Outcomes assessed: H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1***MARKING GUIDELINES**

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Addresses the question asked with a sophisticated and sustained argument, which demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the issue(s) raised in the question• Presents a logical, coherent and well-structured response drawing on a clear identification of relevant key features of the period• Supports interpretation with detailed, relevant and accurate historical information and makes use of appropriate terms and concepts	17–20
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Addresses the question asked with a sound argument, which demonstrates a well-developed understanding of the issue(s) raised in the question• Presents a logical and well-structured response drawing on relevant key features of the period• Provides detailed, relevant and accurate historical information and makes use of appropriate terms and concepts	13–16
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Addresses the question asked with a relevant but largely narrative or descriptive response (may incorporate a simple argument and/or contain implied understanding of the issue(s) raised in the question)• Presents a generally well-structured response, with some identification of the key features of the period• Provides adequate relevant and accurate historical information incorporating some historical terms	9–12
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Presents a narrative or descriptive response, which is largely relevant but may be generalised and/or incomplete• Presents a structured but simple response, with some mention of relevant key features of the period• Provides limited accurate historical information incorporating some historical terms	5–8
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Attempts a narrative or description which may be only generally relevant and/or seriously incomplete• May be disjointed and/or very brief• Provides very limited historical information	1–4

Section II — Personalities

Questions 5 (a)(i), 5 (b)(i), 7 (a)(i), 7 (b)(i), 9 (a)(i), 9 (b)(i), 11 (a)(i), 11 (b)(i), 13 (a)(i), 13 (b)(i), 15 (a)(i), 15 (b)(i), 17 (a)(i), 17 (b)(i), 19 (a)(i), 19 (b)(i)

Outcomes assessed: H1.1, H1.2, H3.1

MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Presents a sustained, logical and well-structured descriptive narration of a comprehensive selection of events• Clearly identifies relevant key features of the specified period of the individual's career• Provides detailed, relevant and accurate historical information using a range of appropriate terms and concepts	9–10
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Presents a well-structured descriptive narration of a substantial selection of events• Identifies key features of the specified period of the individual's career• Provides relevant and accurate historical information using appropriate terms and concepts	7–8
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Presents a descriptive narration of a selection of events• Identifies some key features of the individual's career• Provides adequate and accurate historical information incorporating some historical terms	5–6
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Presents a limited descriptive narration of some events of the individual's career with a simple use of historical information incorporating some historical terms	3–4
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Presents a limited narration of the individual's career, with limited use of historical terms/concepts	1–2

Section II — Personalities

Questions 5 (a)(ii), 5 (b)(ii), 7 (a)(ii), 7 (b)(ii), 9 (a)(ii), 9 (b)(ii), 11 (a)(ii), 11 (b)(ii), 13 (a)(ii), 13 (b)(ii), 15 (a)(ii), 15 (b)(ii), 17 (a)(ii), 17 (b)(ii), 19 (a)(ii), 19 (b)(ii)

Outcomes assessed: H1.1, H1.2, H3.1, H6.1

MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Makes a critical judgement about the role played by the individual in relation to the key feature(s) addressed in the question• Presents a sustained, logical and well-structured argument supported by detailed, relevant and accurate historical information• Provides a clear judgement relating the statement to the personality	9–10
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Makes a sound judgement about the role played by the individual in relation to the key feature(s) addressed in the question• Presents a logical argument supported by detailed, relevant and accurate historical information• Attempts to relate the statement to the personality	7–8
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Describes the role played by the individual in relation to the key feature(s)• Provides adequate and largely accurate historical information• May use the statement by implication	5–6
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provides a limited description of the role played by the individual in relation to key feature(s)• Presents a simple descriptive narration, supported by a basic use of historical information	3–4
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lists some historical events of the period of the specified individual• Presents a very limited narration/description of people and/or events from the past	1–2

Section III — International Studies in Peace and Conflict

Questions 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26

Outcomes assessed: H1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H3.1, H4.2, H6.1

MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses the question asked with a sophisticated and sustained argument, which demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the issue(s) raised in the question Presents a logical, coherent and well-structured response drawing on a clear identification of relevant key features of the period Supports interpretation with detailed, relevant and accurate historical information and makes use of appropriate terms and concepts 	25–30
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses the question asked with a sound argument, which demonstrates a well-developed understanding of the issue(s) raised in the question Presents a logical and well-structured response drawing on relevant key features of the period Provides detailed, relevant and accurate historical information and makes use of appropriate terms and concepts 	19–24
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses the question asked with a relevant but largely narrative or descriptive response (may incorporate a simple argument and/or contain implied understanding of the issue(s) raised in the question) Presents a generally well-structured response, with some identification of the key features of the period Provides adequate relevant and accurate historical information incorporating some historical terms 	13–18
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presents a narrative or descriptive response, which is largely relevant but may be generalised and/or incomplete Presents a structured but simple response, with some mention of relevant key features of the period Provides limited accurate historical information incorporating some historical terms 	7–12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attempts a narrative or description which may be only generally relevant and/or seriously incomplete May be disjointed and/or very brief Provides very limited historical information 	1–6