Modern History marking guide and response

External assessment 2024

Short response (48 marks)

Assessment objectives

This assessment instrument is used to determine student achievement in the following objectives:

- 1. comprehend terms, concepts and issues linked to a topic focused on international experiences in the Modern World
- 3. analyse evidence from historical sources to show understanding that is linked to a topic focused on international experiences in the Modern World
- 4. synthesise evidence from historical sources to form a historical argument that is linked to a topic focused on international experiences in the Modern World
- 5. evaluate evidence from historical sources to make judgments linked to a topic focused on international experiences in the Modern World
- 6. create responses that communicate meaning to suit purpose that is linked to a topic focused on international experiences in the Modern World.

Note: Unit objective 2 is not assessed in this instrument.



Purpose

This document consists of a marking guide and a sample response.

The marking guide:

- provides a tool for calibrating external assessment markers to ensure reliability of results
- indicates the correlation, for each question, between mark allocation and qualities at each level of the mark range
- informs schools and students about how marks are matched to qualities in student responses.

The sample response:

- demonstrates the qualities of a high-level response
- · has been annotated using the marking guide.

Mark allocation

Where a response does not meet any of the descriptors for a question or a criterion, a mark of '0' will be recorded.

Where no response to a question has been made, a mark of 'N' will be recorded.

Marking guide

Question 1

Criterion: Analysing

The response:

- explains a difference in how Menzies's announcement was understood by representatives of the DRV (North Vietnam) and Singapore [1 mark]
- uses well-chosen evidence from Source 1 to develop this explanation [1 mark]
- uses well-chosen evidence from Source 2 to develop this explanation [1 mark]

Criterion: Comprehending

The response:

- includes term/s from Source 1 [1 mark]
- includes term/s from Source 2 [1 mark]
- uses relevant terms from Sources 1 and/or 2 that are placed in historical context [1 mark]

Question 2

Criterion: Analysing

The response:	M
Source 3	
• explains the cartoonist's depiction of Australia's relationship with the USA during the VW, using well-chosen evidence from the source	3
• explains the cartoonist's depiction of Australia's relationship with the USA during the VW, using evidence from the source	2
explains aspect/s of the cartoonist's depiction of Australia's relationship with the USA during the VW, using evidence from the source	1
does not satisfy any of the descriptors above.	0
Source 4	,
• explains the cartoonist's depiction of Australia's relationship with the USA during the VW, using well-chosen evidence from the source	3
• explains the cartoonist's depiction of Australia's relationship with the USA during the VW, using evidence from the source	2
explains aspect/s of the cartoonist's depiction of Australia's relationship with the USA during the VW, using evidence from the source	1
does not satisfy any of the descriptors above.	0

Criterion: Comprehending

The response:

- includes term/s from Source 3 [1 mark]
- includes term/s from Source 4 [1 mark]
- uses relevant terms from Sources 3 and/or 4 that are placed in historical context [1 mark]

Question 3

Criterion: Evaluating

The response:	М
Source 5	
explains a discerning judgment about reliability, using well-chosen evidence from the source	4
explains a judgment about reliability, using evidence from the source	3
makes statements about reliability, referring to evidence from the source	2
makes a statement about the reliability of evidence from the source	1
does not satisfy any of the descriptors above.	0
Source 6	
explains a discerning judgment about reliability, using well-chosen evidence from the source	4
explains a judgment about reliability, using evidence from the source	3
makes statements about reliability, referring to evidence from the source	2
makes a statement about the reliability of evidence from the source	1
does not satisfy any of the descriptors above.	0

Criterion: Comprehending

The response:

• uses relevant terms from Sources 5 and 6 that are placed in historical context [1 mark]

The response:

- demonstrates an understanding of an issue included in Source 5 and/or 6 [1 mark]
- demonstrates an understanding of another issue included in Source 5 and/or 6 [1 mark]

Criterion: Creating and communicating

The response:	М
organises paragraph/s purposefully to succinctly and fluently convey ideas relating to the question	3
organises paragraph/s to convey ideas relating to the question	2
conveys ideas related to the question	1
does not satisfy any of the descriptors above.	0

Question 4

Criterion: Synthesising

The response:	М
develops a sophisticated historical argument that responds to the question fully	4
develops a valid historical argument that responds to the question	3
develops a basic historical argument that responds to the question	2
develops statements that respond to the question	1
does not satisfy any of the descriptors above.	0
The response:	
skilfully combines relevant evidence from all the sources provided to develop the historical argument	5
skilfully combines relevant evidence from three of the sources provided to develop the historical argument	4
combines relevant evidence from all the sources provided to develop the historical argument	3
combines relevant evidence from the sources provided to develop the historical argument	2
refers to relevant evidence from sources when making statements	1
does not satisfy any of the descriptors above.	0

Criterion: Evaluating

The response:	М
makes a judgment about the extent to which evidence from two of the sources provided does or does not corroborate the historical argument	4
makes a judgment about the extent to which evidence from two of the sources provided does or does not corroborate each other	3
makes statements about the extent to which evidence from two of the sources provided does or does not corroborate the historical argument or each other	2
makes a statement about the extent to which evidence from two of the sources provided does or does not corroborate the historical argument or each other	1
does not satisfy any of the descriptors above.	0

Criterion: Comprehending

The response:

- includes term/s from two of the nominated sources [1 mark]
- includes term/s from another two of the nominated sources [1 mark]
- uses relevant terms from Sources 7, 8, 9 and 10 that are placed in historical context [1 mark]

Criterion: Creating and communicating

The response:	М
organises paragraph/s purposefully to succinctly and fluently convey ideas relating to the question	3
organises paragraph/s to convey ideas relating to the question	2
conveys ideas related to the question	1
does not satisfy any of the descriptors above.	0

References

Question 3

Ham, P 2008, Vietnam: The Australian War, p. 563, Harper Collins, Australia.

Trembath, R 2021, 'Aftermath: Vietnam Veterans and their Historians', Australian Policy and History, 22 April, https://aph.org.au/2021/04/aftermath-vietnam-veterans-and-their-historians/#_edn9. Used with permission of Australian Policy and History.

Question 4

Edwards, P 2014, Australia and the Vietnam War, UNSW Press, Sydney, pp. 220–222.

Broinowski, R 2021, The Vote for Cambodia: Australia's diplomatic intervention, Australian Institute of International Affairs, Canberra, pp. 31–32, https://www.internationalaffairs.org.au/publication/the-vote-for-cambodia-australias-diplomatic-intervention/ CC BY-NC-SA 4.0