

**2005 HSC Notes from
the Marking Centre
Modern History**

© 2006 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 1741473756

2006071

Contents

Section I – Core Study – World War I (30 Marks).....	4
Section II – National Study (20 Marks).....	5
Section II – National Studies – Personality (20 Marks)	7
Section III – International Studies in Peace and Conflict (30 Marks).....	10

2005 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 2005 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.

This document should be read along with the relevant syllabus, the 2005 Higher School Certificate examination, the marking guidelines and other support documents that have been developed by the Board of Studies to assist in the teaching and learning of Modern History.

General Comments

9800 candidates sat the Modern History paper in 2005.

There was a decline from previous years in 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 effectively.

In average responses candidates did not focus on the relevant issues or they wrote in general terms about the issue. Weaker responses often simply wrote about the events of the period without linking them to the question. Candidates sometimes 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 did not have particular problems with any questions. However, it is noticeable that many candidates need to take more care in determining what the question is asking of them before they begin to answer.

Specific Comments

Question 1

Candidates generally had no problems with the questions, with 90% scoring in the top marking range. Candidates need to be aware of the importance of reading questions carefully. Some candidates misread Question a (ii) as ‘when’ instead of ‘where’, and in some cases misread the map. Candidates are reminded that if they are asked to refer to two sources they must not think they can refer to two aspects of one source.

Question 2

Better responses tended to use their own knowledge and support this with information from the sources. The best answers went beyond the Battle of the Somme, discussing other factors that attempted to break the stalemate. When asked to refer to Source A, some candidates discussed most of the content in both parts, ie the timeline and map, and therefore compromised their ability to provide extensive own knowledge. Candidates' main focus should be on the actual question being asked.

Question 3

Candidates appeared to understand the question, but many had difficulty discussing the perspective of the internet reference site. Candidates merely treated it as they would any secondary source. Perspective was generally taken as just a different point of view rather than showing a wider understanding of perspective.

Weaker candidates continue to make simplistic statements such as primary sources being more reliable than secondary.

Many candidates used the poem as a literary piece, discussing its composition rather than its historical content. Many candidates included an enormous amount of poetic analysis.

While there was a slight improvement from the previous year, weaker candidates were still unable to distinguish between 'useful' and 'reliable'. Many candidates chose to discuss them together rather than making clear why the source might be 'useful' and/or 'reliable'.

Candidates need to be reminded that they should not prepare a generic answer and hope to apply it to the sources.

Candidates are being asked to show their skills with unseen sources.

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 2004.

Germany 67%

Russia 20%

USA 8%

China 2%

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

Specific Comments

Question 4

USA: 80% attempted 4 (a) and 20% attempted 4 (b)

- (a) Better candidates included detailed information on ‘changes in American society’ and successfully linked these changes to racial tension. These responses had a sophisticated range of analytical discussion and understood ‘racial tension’ to include a range of racial issues. The weaker responses tended to give a general response on race in the USA, focusing on issues with Black Americans. They failed to link racial tension to changes in American society and often didn’t use the full time period ie to the end of the 1920s.
- (b) In better responses, candidates grappled with the issues involved in an evaluation of the success of the New Deal. They discussed the aims of the legislation and were able to make sophisticated judgements about the degree of success. Weaker responses tended to describe some of the New Deal policies with limited information and / or argument.

Question 10

Russia: 38% attempted 10 (a) and 62% attempted 10 (b)

- (a) The best answers to this question demonstrated clear understanding of the nature of Communist ideology and were able to evaluate the changes made by Lenin. Some considered factors in the consolidation of power other than Lenin in order to evaluate the word ‘only’. Mention was made of War Communism, requisitioning, use of terror/Cheka, Civil War and the role Kronstadt in bringing about NEP (as the most obvious example of the modification of ideology). Most candidates finished their essays at 1921 with the NEP. In weaker responses there was narration of events with more or less detail and little consideration of the question.
- (b) An excellent understanding of the key features of Stalinism was evident in the best answers. An awareness of change was also important as Stalinism developed during the time period. The best responses were focused on economic and social life rather than political. Supporting information was drawn from collectivisation, industrialisation and the effects on people of terror and the purges. Weaker responses presented little information and consisted of prepared answers on Stalinism or Totalitarianism, which involved considerable narration. They also tended to include events before 1928 (ie the power struggle) or after 1941 (ie the Great Patriotic War).

Question 12

Germany: 23% attempted 12 (a) and 77% attempted 12 (b)

- (a) In the better responses, candidates clearly assessed the impact of conservative parties and elites on German politics, analysing how they undermined Weimar democracy and therefore helped Hitler and the Nazi Party gain power. Weaker responses generally interpreted the question as collapse of Weimar / rise of Hitler and the Nazi Party question and thus failed to address the key issues raised in the question. These candidates did, however, show a sound knowledge of the main events of the period.

- (b) In the better responses, candidates were able to clearly evaluate the issue of ‘totalitarian society’ drawing on various definitions of totalitarianism and analysing the extent to which Nazi Germany matched the set criteria. In weaker responses, candidates generally made the simple claim that it was totalitarian and gave a fairly narrative descriptive response.

Japan: 41% attempted (a) and 59% attempted (b)

China: 45% attempted (a) and 55% attempted (b)

India: 31% attempted (a) and 69% attempted (b)

Australia: 76% attempted (a) and 24% attempted (b)

Indonesia: 100% 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 some 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.

A small number of 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: 26% attempted Hearst and 74% attempted Hoover

- (a) (i) Better responses confined themselves to the time period of 1898-1941 with very little in the way of material pre-1898 or post-1941. They also confined their narration to public life, with minimal detail of Hearst’s marriage and affairs. Weaker responses tended to be indiscriminating in the selection of events.
- (ii) Better responses established what the changing nature of American society was during Hearst’s time and how Hearst and his newspapers were able to influence society and respond to change. They were able to discuss and evaluate the Melting Pot and changing attitudes to immigration, changes in society’s views on foreign incursion and attitudes to government intervention. They also recognised that Hearst was out of touch with American views on the Depression after he supported Landon in 1936. In weaker

responses, candidates dealt with what Hearst's papers had to say with little evaluation or reference to the question.

- (b) (i) The better responses started with Hoover joining the Attorney General and his role in the Palmer Raids and continued through his career at the Bureau of Investigation and the FBI. They described the reforms he introduced at the FBI and the actions he took as its Director. Weaker responses did not make a connection between the events and omitted some of the more significant ones.

Candidates had some difficulty with adhering to the 1898-1941 time period and public life.

- (ii) The better responses established the problems the Prohibition Era created before they attempted to evaluate Hoover's response. They also argued that while Hoover did attempt to deal with Prohibition he also seemed more interested in his profile with the public and the press. Weaker responses provided a discussion of Prohibition with limited evaluation of Hoover's response to the attendant problems.

Question 7

Japan: 63% attempted Hirohito and 37% attempted Ikki

Question 9

China: 64% attempted Sun Yixian and 36% attempted Zhu De

Question 11

Russia: 18% attempted Kollontai and 82% attempted Trotsky

- (a) (i) Better responses provided a comprehensive coverage of key events, qualified the term 'public' and extended the coverage of her public life to her career outside the Soviet Union. Weaker responses presented a sequence of events lacking in depth, or description that tended to focus only on her public life in Russia.
- (ii) The amount and level of evaluation was the discriminating factor as better responses explored the reforms she introduced and the effect they had post-1917. Stalin's reversal of reforms was a crucial part of better responses. Poorer answers tended to list reforms without evaluating Kollontai's role or the effect of the reforms.
- (b) (i) Better responses gave a comprehensive coverage of key events and outlined their significance within the specified time frame. There was some variety of interpretation of 'public' and the better responses clarified this. They also continued the narrative solidly through Trotsky's exile. Poorer responses presented a sequence of events lacking in depth or description, and wandered outside the specified time-frame.
- (ii) Better responses gave a sophisticated evaluation of Trotsky's role and included elements of historical debate. Responses were well written, with logical, well-supported arguments. However some candidates used historians as padding rather than linking

their views to the argument. Weaker responses tended to be a description of Trotsky's achievements without linking them to any form of evaluation.

Question 13

Germany: 36% attempted Riefenstahl and 64% attempted Speer

- (a) (i) Better answers gave a comprehensive selection of the main features of Riefenstahl's public life using accurate, detailed historical information. They provided a well structured connecting narrative. Weaker responses presented a sequence of events lacking in depth or description, and wandered outside the specified time frame.
- (ii) Better responses made a successful link between their understanding of Riefenstahl's career and Nazi attempts at transforming German social and cultural life. They evaluated her role in the promotion of the Fuehrer as leader, the adoration of Aryan superiority and the limiting of cultural freedom under the Reich Chamber of Culture, of which she was a member. Weaker responses described her career and struggled to link it to social and cultural life. Some candidates mentioned her film techniques which were largely irrelevant to this question.
- (b) (i) Better answers gave a comprehensive selection of the main features of Speer's public life using accurate, detailed historical information, and provided a well structured connecting narrative. Poorer responses tended to cover events in minimal detail from a narrow time perspective (eg stopping at 1942), sometimes referring excessively to irrelevancies about his private life. These responses often lacked a narrative structure.
- (ii) Better responses provided evidence to support their claims (eg reference to the Wolters chronicle, or reference to eviction of Jews from flats). These candidates also presented a sophisticated evaluation, provided historical debate, and sustained an argument. Weaker responses typically made no real attempt to evaluate Speer's role. Often they dealt only with Jews and made no reference to Nazi policies about other races. Poorer responses gave a generalised description about Speer during the period of the Final Solution. Some candidates presented historical quotes without linking them to an argument.

Question 15

India: 6% attempted Nehru and 94% attempted Jinnah

Question 17

Australia: 100% attempted Evatt and 0% attempted Fraser

Question 19

Indonesia: 100% attempted Toer and 0% 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. Candidates were generally able to understand the issues raised in the questions and apply their knowledge to them. However better responses provided sustained and sophisticated arguments that focused directly on the key issues in the question. Better responses also used historiography in their argument.

Percentage of candidates attempting Options

Conflict in Indochina 1954–1979	37 %
The Cold War 1945–1991	26 %
Arab–Israel Conflict 1948–1996	13 %
Conflict in the Pacific 1937–1951	17 %
Anglo-Irish Relations 1968–1998	3 %
Conflict in South Africa 1947–1994	3 %
The United Nations as Peacekeeper 1946–1999	1 %

Question 20

Conflict in the Pacific: 71% attempted 20 (a) and 29% attempted 20 (b)

- (a) Most candidates had a sound knowledge of the events of World War 2. Better responses were able to differentiate between the specific strategies. Strategies and tactics were almost universally treated as the same thing. In the better responses, candidates were able to assess how strategies changed and argue why some strategies were more effective than others. A number of responses addressed ‘why Japan lost the war’ rather than the question asked.
- (b) Candidates had a fair understanding of the key effects of the war on Asian peoples – the end of the myth of western superiority, the growth of nationalist movements, the poor treatment of Asian peoples under Japanese occupation. The better responses argued the degree of impact on specific South East Asian countries and dealt with decolonisation beyond 1945.

Question 21

The Cold War: 88% attempted 21 (a) and 12% attempted 21 (b)

- (a) Better responses were able to provide evaluation of the extent to which the USSR’s policies were responsible for the Cold War. These responses argued that the USSR’s policies were a reaction to a number of factors such as security concerns and US policies. They integrated detailed analysis of more than one crisis into their argument. Responses that only dealt with one crisis were not disadvantaged; however, the crisis needed to be analysed in detail within the context of an argument that focused on the question. Weaker responses simply narrated the events of a crisis and / or ideological factors and did not adequately address the question.

- (b) In better responses, candidates assessed the impact of nuclear protesters in influencing arms limitation during the Cold War in the context of other factors. Weaker responses simply referred to protesters and dismissed their role. Such responses demonstrated limited knowledge of the role of nuclear protesters in the overall Cold War context. Generally these responses described elements of Cold War ideology and events.

Question 22

The United Nations as Peacekeeper: 22% attempted 22 (a) and 78% attempted 22 (b)

Question 23

Conflict in South Africa: 84% attempted 23 (a) and 16% attempted 23 (b)

Question 24

Arab–Israel Conflict: 56% attempted 24 (a) and 44% attempted 24 (b)

- (a) Better responses were sophisticated and discussed the influence of pan-Arab nationalism, seeing that influence as both positive and negative and questioning its role in key events such as the 1948 war, the Suez crisis and the Camp David accords. Weaker responses simply gave a chronology of key events from 1948 to 1979, making little reference to the concept of pan-Arab nationalism.
- (b) Better responses challenged the idea that the PLO and Hamas were to blame for the slow progress of peace. These candidates made links between Israeli policy, regional issues, international concerns and the PLO and Hamas. Candidates needed to address both the PLO and Hamas. Weaker responses tended to outline the activities of the PLO and / or Hamas and made very few links to the issue of peace and its slow progress.

Question 25

Conflict in Indochina: 57% attempted 25 (a) and 43% attempted 25 (b)

- (a) Better responses demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of the anti-war movement and were able to evaluate its impact on the US government's decision to withdraw from Vietnam. Weaker responses generalised about the anti-war movement and / or described reasons for the US withdrawal.
- (b) Better responses evaluated the degree of US responsibility in both South Vietnam and Cambodia. These candidates provided comprehensive answers that analysed the responsibility of various groups for the suffering of villagers in the period 1954-1979. Weaker responses were focused solely on US responsibility and described key features of the period.

Question 26

Anglo–Irish Relations: 60% attempted (a) and 40% attempted (b)

Modern History

2005 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 (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) (ii)	1	H5.1	H5.1
1 (b) (iii)	2	World War I and its Aftermath	H5.1
1 (c)	2	World War I and its Aftermath	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, H6.1
7 (b) (ii)	10	Japan – Kita Ikki	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1, H6.1

Question	Marks	Content	Syllabus outcomes
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 Jinah	H1.1, H1.2, H3.1
15 (b) (ii)	10	India – Mohammad Ali Jinah	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
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

Question	Marks	Content	Syllabus outcomes
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

2005 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
• 23 June 1916 OR 23 June	1

Question 1 (a) (ii)

Outcomes assessed: H5.1

MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
• Delville Wood	1

Question 1 (a) (iii)

Outcomes assessed: H5.1

MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
• The Allies or Britain	1

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

Criteria	Marks
• Somme River	1

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

Criteria	Marks
• General Douglas Haig	1

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

Criteria	Marks
• German Army	1

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

Criteria	Marks
Any TWO of <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Germans lost confidence• British gained confidence• British proved themselves to the world• Many valuable lessons were learned	2

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

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• From Source A: Rain turned battlefield to bog in October• Snow fell in November• In Source B: Haig suggests that it was the weather that gave the enemy some respite• To be awarded 2 marks students must use both sources	2

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 evaluation that demonstrates breadth of own relevant knowledge combined with specific use of BOTH sources• Demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of the impact of the Battle of the Somme on the stalemate on the Western Front	9–10
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provides a clear judgement with appropriate use of BOTH sources and use of own relevant knowledge• Demonstrates sound knowledge of the relationship between the Battle of the Somme and stalemate on the Western Front	7–8
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Competently uses relevant knowledge and makes specific reference to at least ONE source OR uses sources only OR uses own knowledge only• Makes generalisations about the relationship between the Battle of the Somme and the stalemate on the Western Front	5–6
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Limited use of knowledge and sources, relying largely on simple description or narrative of the Western Front and the Somme	3–4
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• One or two references to the Battle of the Somme and/or stalemate on the Western Front	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 <p>OR</p> <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 <p>OR</p> <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 attempt at an 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 which may 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 features• 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 features• 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 features• 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">Evaluates the role played by the individual in relation to the key feature(s) addressed in the questionPresents a sustained, logical and well-structured argument supported by detailed, relevant and accurate historical information	9–10
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Attempts an evaluation of the role played by the individual in relation to the key feature(s) addressed in the questionPresents a logical argument supported by detailed, relevant and accurate historical information	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	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 individualPresents 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 attempt at an 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 which may 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