2001 HSC History Extension
Marking Guidelines

Question 1 (25 marks)

Outcomes assessed: E2.2, E2.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARKING GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Presents a well-structured text that provides a detailed, coherent and complex discussion supported by reference to the Source and other sources  
  • Identifies key historiographical issues from the sources to illustrate how historians use them to reconstruct the past  
  • Provides a clear and critical discussion of the use of evidence by historians to reconstruct the past | 21–25 |
| • Presents a well-structured text that provides a detailed and coherent discussion supported by reference to the Source and other sources  
  • Identifies historiographical issues from the sources to illustrate how historians attempt to reconstruct the past  
  • Provides a clear discussion of the use of evidence in the historians’ attempt to reconstruct the past | 16–20 |
| • Presents a well-structured text that provides a coherent discussion supported by reference to the Source and at least one other source  
  • Identifies some historiographical issues from the sources  
  • Includes some discussion of the historians’ reconstruction of the past | 11–15 |
| • Presents a limited discussion supported by some reference to the Source and at least one other source  
  • Identifies an issue from the Source provided  
  • Presents a limited description of how historians reconstruct the past | 6–10 |
| • Presents a limited discussion of the Source  
  • May identify an issue from the Source  
  • Makes some reference to the use of evidence by historians to reconstruct the past | 1–5 |
Question 2 (25 marks)

Outcomes assessed: E1.1, E2.2

**MARKING GUIDELINES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Presents a sustained coherent and complex discussion using one historical interpretation in the case study and the way in which at least one other interpretation differs  
  • Clearly identifies the differing interpretations by discussing relevant historiographical issues  
  • Presents a balanced treatment of the different interpretations and the areas of debate chosen for the discussion | 21–25 |
| • Presents a sustained coherent discussion using one historical interpretation in the case study and the way in which at least one other interpretation differs  
  • Identifies the differing interpretations with reference to relevant historiographical issues  
  • Presents a balanced treatment of the different interpretations and the areas of debate chosen for the discussion | 16–20 |
| • Presents a discussion using one historical interpretation in the case study and the way in which at least one other interpretation differs  
  • Identifies some areas of difference in the interpretations with some attempt to discuss the differences  
  • Some attempt to give a balanced treatment of the different interpretations and the areas of debate chosen for the discussion | 11–15 |
| • Presents some discussion using one historical interpretation in the case study and refers to at least one other differing interpretation  
  • Limited identification of some areas of difference in the interpretations  
  • Limited attempt to give a balanced treatment | 6–10 |
| • Presents a response that is largely descriptive but makes reference to the historical interpretation in the case study and one other interpretation | 1–5 |