2022 Modern History Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the 2022 assessment cycle, gives an overview of how students performed in their school and external assessments in relation to the learning requirements, assessment design criteria, and performance standards set out in the relevant subject outline. They provide information and advice regarding the assessment types, the application of the performance standards in school and external assessments, and the quality of student performance.

Teachers should refer to the subject outline for specifications on content and learning requirements, and to the subject operational information for operational matters and key dates.

Across the Assessment Types for this subject, students can present their responses in oral or multimodal form, where 6 minutes is the equivalent of 1000 words. Students should not speed-up the recording of their videos excessively in an attempt to condense more content into the maximum time limit.

From 2023, if a video is flagged by markers/moderators as impacted by speed, schools will be requested to provide a transcript and markers/moderators will be advised to mark/moderate based on the evidence in the transcript, only considering evidence up to the maximum word limit (e.g. up to 2000 words for AT3).

If the speed of the recording makes the speech incomprehensible, it affects the accuracy of transcriptions and it also impacts the ability of markers/moderators to find evidence of student achievement against the performance standards.

School Assessment

Assessment Type 1: Historical Skills

It was pleasing to see that more teachers and students made the effort to access the 2021 Subject Assessment Advice, and where appropriate take measures to amend and improve practises based on explicit feedback provided. Teachers should recognise that task design and the types of tasks being set are critical in providing students with opportunities to attain the highest levels of achievement against each performance standard. This is especially relevant for the Application and Evaluation criteria, where task design allows students to demonstrate evidence of a higher level of critical analysis of sources and a range of historical perspectives. Teachers should also pay attention to the different, specific features being assessed in the Analysis assessment design criteria, with the focus lending itself to informing the study of Modern Nations and The World Since 1945. There were examples where teachers clearly provided opportunities for students to extend their knowledge and understanding beyond the content being taught in class.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* due to the nature of the subject, the more support that schools can give moderators when confirming grades, the better. This includes attaching task sheets, marked rubrics for all students included in the sample and/or comments indicating how a grade was arrived at for individual tasks/student work
* there appeared to be a number of teachers identifying 'Special Provisions' for missing tasks - this is of concern, especially for some who had students in the A+/A Band as it was obvious that there was some confusion between Special Provisions and Covid Adjustments - some teachers removed individual tasks for individual students, rather than the same task for all students
* ensure LAPS and any variations are included.

The more successful responses commonly:

* allowed students to develop and demonstrate a selection of three or four specific features in each task
* resulted from tasks that were designed with specific criteria in mind that clearly linked to the learning objectives of the course and specific features of the assessment design criteria. Often tasks instructions included specific reference to the criteria being assessed in the task
* were derived from tasks which were obviously intrinsically motivating, providing engagement for students and for the scope for applying individual flair
* demonstrated clear and innovative task design that allowed students to show their application of a variety of historical skills in a myriad of ways. Specific examples included a round table United Nations discussion where students assumed the role of key political and historical figures including creating a sources analysis broadsheet, obituaries, advocacy speeches, magazine articles, podcasts, sources trail, curating a museum and evaluating historiographical approaches to periods. Nation Study tasks focussed more on extended responses including essays and reports
* demonstrated knowledge and understanding of different perspectives and points of view about the issue being explored. E.g. empathetic writing tasks which were designed to include writing from one or two individuals with short introductory biographical detail provided for each writer. These tasks evoked some strong responses and a high level of personal connection
* included at least one Source Analysis task that was formatted in a similar style to that which is assessed in the end of year examination. Student creation of Sources Analysis was especially done well and a differing range of source types had been included - film snippets, speeches, letters. This included many teachers designing a task that required their students to construct their own sources analysis task and answer questions linked to either Modern Nations or The World Since 1945
* were based on interesting and increasingly sophisticated tasks that included the study of different historical schools of thought and the writing of history, with tasks requiring students to compare specific historians
* covered three or more arguments (including at least one clear counter argument) in extended responses to the question being posed
* included tasks that demonstrated the application of historical conventions, (i.e. planned paragraphs that thoroughly synthesised evidence) included topic sentences, explained, and discussed highly relevant evidence, and drew conclusions on what the evidence showed
* prompted students to develop arguments, especially focussed on motives of individuals and groups
* addressed key concepts directly (e.g. by providing evidence that they have been understood and explored, i.e. by providing a clear definition linked to ideas, people and events, and by identifying in the introduction the aspects of the concept that would be explored in the task)
* used sources/quotes/statistics to support their arguments (usually providing a thesis and explaining their understanding, then using evidence to support their position)
* included rigorous and accurate scholarship when locating research
* demonstrated analysis that made specific comments using the language of the performance standard to reinforce that they were addressing the performance standard
* demonstrated understanding and facility in using subject specific language when analysing sources, particularly when dealing with the concepts of origin, type (or nature of the source), bias, perspective, and reliability
* required students to use consistent and accurate referencing and bibliographical conventions
* identified and evaluated both internal and external challenges, justifying judgements made about their interdependence and relative significance
* applied specific knowledge of short term and long-term interactions and relationships, using it to demonstrate how they changed during the time frame
* it was less common than in previous years for a task to be completed under test or timed conditions. When these were undertaken, students were provided with the opportunity to draft and polish their final responses in order to allow students to produce work that reflected performance standards in the higher-grade bands
* the Skills component is often dictated by the quality of the task design. Students who were successful were able to engage more fully with the Analysis 1 and 2 standards
* demonstrated clear and innovative task design that allowed students to show their application of a variety of historical skills in a myriad of ways including creating a sources analysis broadsheet, obituaries, podcasts, sources trail, curating a museum and evaluating historiographical approaches to periods. Nation Study tasks focussed more on extended responses including essays and reports
* demonstrated knowledge and understanding of different perspectives and points of view about the issue being explored (e.g. empathetic writing tasks which were designed to included writing from one or two individuals with short introductory biographical detail provided for each writer)
* tasks were designed with specific criteria in mind that clearly linked to the learning objectives of the course and specific features of the performance standards. Often tasks instructions included specific reference to the criteria being assessed in the task
* included rigorous and accurate scholarship when locating research
* many Historical Skills samples included at least one Source Analysis task that was formatted in a similar style to that which is assessed in the end of year Examination. This included many teachers designing a task that required their students to construct their own sources analysis task and answer questions linked to either Modern Nations or The World Since 1945
* there were several interesting and increasingly sophisticated tasks that included the study of different historical schools of thought and the writing of history, with tasks requiring students to compare specific historians
* covered three or more arguments (including at least one clear counter argument) in extended responses to the question being posed
* included tasks that demonstrated the application of historical conventions, (i.e. planned paragraphs that thoroughly synthesised evidence). Included topic sentences, explained and discussed highly relevant evidence, and drew conclusions on what the evidence showed.
* prompted students to develop arguments, especially focussed on motives of individuals and groups
* addressed key concepts directly (e.g. by providing evidence that they have been understood and explored, i.e. by providing a clear definition linked to ideas, people and events, and by identifying in the introduction the aspects of the concept that would be explored in the task).
* demonstrated understanding and facility in using subject specific language when analysing sources, particularly when dealing with the concepts of origin, type (or nature of the source), bias, perspective and reliability
* required students to use consistent and accurate referencing and bibliographical conventions
* identified and evaluated both internal and external challenges, justifying judgements made about their interdependence and relative significance
* applied specific knowledge of short term and long-term interactions and relationships, using it to demonstrate how they changed during the time frame.

The less successful responses commonly:

* included tasks that assessed five or six specific features tended to demonstrate uneven and superficial evidence against some performance standards
* Addressed Understanding and Exploration — did not include accurate details about ideas, events, and people
* provided a recount when the task required an argument in order to meet the performance standards assessed.
* open ended research and report style tasks do not give students the opportunity to show the reflection and evaluation, and inquiry and analysis criteria. e.g. pieces of empathetic writing which did not encourage the demonstration and understanding of the social, political and economic factors and experiences ideas which lay behind beliefs and motives
* Application and Evaluation — made judgements/statements/used statistics/quotes without citing any sources and therefore not demonstrating where and how information was collected, making it harder to confirm all A and E performance standards
* provided inconsistent citation methods within a single assessment piece
* did not provide students with the opportunity to view an issue from different perspectives
* exceeded the word limit or multimodal time limit
* contained no research undertaken in any task throughout the folio, with no use of referencing or a poorly constructed/no bibliography
* lacked application of historical conventions in essays and sources analysis tasks
* Analysis — demonstrated these performance standards through implied analysis rather than explicitly addressing the performance standards
* described, rather than discussed and analysed ideas, factors involved in a situation.
* many Historical Skills Folios included at least one Source Analysis task that was formatted in a similar style to that which is assessed in the end of year Examination. If completing one of these as a summative task, it is suggested that you provide the opportunity for students to draft their responses before submitting a final task to allow for them to meet higher grade bands
* schools continue to use past exam questions as their essay questions without considering if the parameters needed to be changed based on the updated course (e.g. a Dictator rose to power because of… rather than the Nazi Party rose to power because…)

Assessment Type 2: Historical study

The overall standard of the Historical Studies submitted have improved. It was pleasing to see that there are some very interesting topics and areas of study being undertaken including India, the feminist movement, religion and the treatment of different minority groups and genocide. There was a growing number of Historical Studies that explored topics related to Australian History. In 2021, there were more teachers using the option to present the Historical Study in a multimodal format.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* the formulation and construction of the question is the most critical factor that influences success in this assessment type
* teachers are encouraged to work closely and guide students in the initial stages of this assessment type to help in the formulation of an effective question/hypothesis to form the focus of the historical study. The most effective questions/hypotheses have a very clear specific focus, including time frame and place
* Historical study’s all should have w clearly defined and relevant arguments and counter arguments, regardless of whether students choose the format of an essay, report or multimodal
* teachers are reminded that there is scope to differentiate the task design for individual students for students to present their understanding in a format most suited to them
* there are also some schools that mark different performance standards for different students, dependent on the scope of their question (this specifically relates to A1 and A2 specific features), that can be advantageous in allowing students to achieve at the higher-grade band
* ensure students adhere to word count or time allocated.

The more successful responses commonly:

* focussed on a historical topic that had a clearly defined contextual focus and specific scope, including time frame and place
* focussed on a question that invited reasoned historical argument. This approach was critical to allow student’s the opportunity to achieve at the higher-grade bands of Application and Evaluation
* applied evidence about events, ideas, and people in a careful, purposeful way to address the focus of their question
* provided a clear introduction which included the question’s context, unpacked and explained the key terms, and clearly outlined the case the study would elaborate
* addressed key terms directly, providing evidence that they had been understood and explored
* demonstrated knowledge and understanding of different perspectives and points of view about the idea, event or person being explored
* covered four or more points (a two or more paragraphs arguing for the proposition, followed by at least one counter argument) to demonstrate a wider understanding
* demonstrated the use of a variety of primary and secondary sources, including speeches, diaries, artwork, propaganda, and eyewitness accounts. These sources were used to demonstrate a critical understanding of evidence
* were film analysis and literature analysis style questions. Higher achieving students used these texts as historical sources and engaged in a reasoned historical argument of reliability and limitations. Most successful essays carefully chose other primary and secondary sources to compare and contrast
* included and evaluated different perspectives from (e.g. participants, commentators or historians)
* planned paragraphs thoroughly to synthesise evidence: included topic sentences, explained and discussed highly relevant evidence, and summed up what the evidence showed
* constructed a very coherent argument in their study through their focus on the question, outlining of their argument in the introduction and through the use of connecting words and phrases at the beginning or end of paragraphs
* included counter argument, either within the discussion in each paragraph, or in a separate paragraph
* ended with a comprehensive conclusion which provided a direct answer to the question, summarized the main arguments and often incorporated implications of the answer
* used a consistent form of referencing and a bibliography and adhered to the word count
* demonstrated a high level of academic research. This was evident by students who showed a sophisticated use and engagement of historiography
* demonstrated careful consideration of the types of sources used - including use of academic journals and scholarly works
* demonstrated critical thinking skills when discussing and evaluating relevant sources, both internal and external issues and challenges, or long and short-term interactions and relationships.

The less successful responses commonly:

* required students to demonstrate achievement against several specific features, including UE1 and both A1 and A2
* were too broad in scope to be addressed in 2000 words or 12 minutes
* were questions which did not provide scope from students to look at social, economic, political, religious, ideological, or cultural issues
* focused on contemporary issues without establishing sufficient connections with historical background/ nature
* some students chose to address questions that would have been better suited to subjects such as Legal Studies or Psychology. There seems to be a trend towards true crime cases, that sometimes results in a Historical study that does not address the significance of the political, economic, social, or cultural significant developments of the time
* were in response to questions that lead to students simply retelling how events and developments unfolded
* tried to cover too large a time frame, geographical region, or scope
* chose topics that were under sourced
* topics that investigate the value of a person (based on gossip) or very subjective topics do not lend themselves to historical argument
* investigated a conspiracy theory or popular perspective of a major historical figure, meaning that there was less scope to develop an argument
* were questions which were more literary than historical (e.g. “To what extent did Mary Shelley pioneer the genre of science fiction?”)
* did not effectively conclude or resolve the question
* drew conclusions but provided no evidence to substantiate their findings
* simply presented information without synthesising ideas and show a lack of discernment of relevant historical details and examples
* relied on non-scholarly internet sources and did not evaluate their reliability or validity
* were poorly structured and lacked clear topic and closing sentences
* if students are using a report style format with headings, images, graphs etc it is crucial that there is sustained historical argument throughout and connections between arguments. This format often does not allow students to synthesise evidence and make clear judgements on their value of informing the argument presented
* if students are using visual evidence or graphs they must make explicit connections with the argument being presented and draw clear inclusions
* did not actively engage with sources
* lacked a reasoned historical argument including a counter argument
* where multimodal presentations are used, it is imperative that a reference list is provided to acknowledge sources
* lacked a consistent form of referencing and accurate bibliography
* described, rather than discussed and analysed, the ideas, events and thoughts, motives and actions of individuals or groups
* used few sources
* were too similar to topics covered as part of the subject outline
* lacked originality and responded to topics that were clichéd
* students needs to develop a thesis and should not be writing narrative reports.

External Assessment

Assessment Type 3: Examination

The students of 2022 managed their time extremely well overall judging by the small number of incomplete responses. Once again, the propositions in Part A rewarded students who possessed the relevant knowledge and the ability to apply that knowledge in a well-structured and articulate argument. However, a large proportion of the responses to the most popular questions (i.e. Questions 7 and 8) were of a disappointing standard. These responses were largely narratives rather than carefully constructed arguments and counter‑arguments. It may be helpful for teachers to remind students of the importance of the TEEL format when structuring body paragraphs so that they make and support a point rather than providing information. As in previous years, a significant number of high-quality responses were found in less popular topics and questions.

Students found a segment from a documentary on the Battle of Waterloo as the electronic source for Part B. It was impressive to note that most students clearly understood the content of all of the sources and thus provided high-quality responses. While many students were able to effectively draw conclusions, there remains a need for continued focus on this skill. An even greater percentage of students’ responses to Question (f) were better than in previous years. However, there is a growing trend of students not considering the inherent strengths and limitations of podcasts and cartoons based on their origin and nature in Question 19(e). Many students focussed solely on the strengths and limitations of the content of the sources, not the format/medium. Given that recent and future exams will contain at least one electronic source, it may be beneficial for teachers help students identify the inherent strengths and limitations of modern communication platforms, such as podcasts, blogs, vlogs and documentaries.

Markers’ overall observations were that:

* Questions 7 and 8 continue to be by far the most popular questions
* only a very small proportion of essays were in the high-grade band
* students overall were more successful in their responses in Part B of the exam than they were in Part A.

Part A

More successful essays responses commonly:

* responded to the wording of the proposition and used it to drive their topic sentences and analysis
* provided breadth of exploration in their argument and counter-argument
* incorporated short-and long-term features and factors
* considered internal and external forces related to the proposition where appropriate
* used the introduction to clarify their meaning of key words and terms in the proposition and preview/foreshadow their argument and counter-argument
* connected factors and forces to strengthen their argument and counter-argument
* consistently and accurately used key words or terms from the proposition
* showed evidence of planning
* displayed an understanding of historical concepts without naming them (e.g. cause and effect, continuity and change, significance, evidence)
* utilised the introduction of their essay to clarify the terms in the question which led them to clear judgement and foreshadowed the argument and counter-argument
* effectively used topic sentences to signpost the aspect of argument to be developed in each paragraph, rather than just provide an indication the area of the topic to be addressed in the paragraph
* contained comprehensive conclusions that summarised the key points made in the preceding paragraphs
* connected points to each other, as well as to the question, giving depth and strength to these responses
* provided specific evidence for their reasoning
* integrated the counter-argument into the whole essay, adding depth to their argument
* applied relevant and accurate evidence to illustrate the points being made
* made detailed, direct and nuanced connections and judgements about ideas, events and/or people and their impacts in relation to the question
* tended to organise paragraphs by ideas (social, political, economic) rather than events which allowed for more complex connections between internal and external events forces and challenges
* presented specific and detailed short-term and long-term consequences linking directly with the essay question.

Less successful essay responses commonly:

* provided a brief background to the topic in their introduction rather than outlining their argument and counter-argument
* a concerning number of essay responses did not address the complete proposition or lacked any counter-argument
* a concerning number of essay responses described or discussed the topic and didn’t clarify their understanding of key words or terms from the proposition without providing an argument
* many essays contained unsupported generalisations
* struggled to understand the cultural aspects of a proposition
* quite a few essays recounted information from outside the time frame of proposition
* many essays contained irrelevant information
* lacked an argument or provided a cursory one.

Part B

More successful responses:

* were well-structured
* contained relevant evidence from sources when required.

Less successful responses

* provided responses without reference to any evidence from the source
* stated that sources are limited without reasoning
* did not address the nature of sources clearly
* did not explain how the nature and origin of the sources were a strength or limitation
* did not include of the source in the response.

Essays

Question 1

There were very few responses to this question.

More successful responses:

* demonstrated strong knowledge and understanding of events and personalities that affected and involved the Labor Party during the 1930s.

Question 2

There were very few responses to this question.

Less successful responses:

* made generalised statement
* provided few specifics (e.g. country of origin)
* provided little or no counter-argument
* focussed only on ‘Populate or Perish’ as the only motivation.

Question 3

There were too few responses to this question to provide meaningful feedback.

Question 4

There were few responses to this question.

Less successful responses:

* showed little knowledge and understanding of the Nye Committees’ recommendations
* showed little understanding of the domestic and international forces shaping American foreign policy in this era.

Question 5

This was a popular and well-answered question.

More successful answers:

* developed a strong counter‑argument with relevant evidence based around the experiences of First Nations peoples, African-Americans and women
* identified a range of agencies and programs and distinguished between their degrees of success in relation to the proposition using specific examples
* stated groups who were left behind with explanation of how, where and why.

Less successful answers:

* included only a description of the New Deal
* focussed on the Great Depression and the Hoover administration
* were vague and generalised
* provided a strong counter-argument but no argument
* lacked evidence to support points.

Question 6

More successful answers:

* clearly explained the nature of the American identity in 1941
* developed a strong counter-argument about the limited impact of wartime experiences on minority groups, particularly women and African-Americans.

Less successful answers:

* focussed solely on the effects of the war in Europe against Nazi Germany
* wrote about working women without connecting it to the proposition.

Question 7

There were a large number of responses to this question.

More successful responses:

* showed perceptive understanding of the reasons behind varied responses to the modernisation and Americanisation of German life during the 1920s and the differing attitudes to them throughout Germany
* explained the connection between widespread attitudes to the Weimar Republic and political discord and economic distress at times
* appreciated that German society and culture reflected these tensions and stresses
* distinguished between different times frames and the nature of the social changes in each
* identifies reasons for changes in German society and culture
* considered the opinions, experiences, perspectives and responses from a range of German groups (e.g. military, rural, young urban dwellers, workers)
* highlighted the effects of other influences, such as the Treaty of Versailles, Guilt Clause, poor economy.

Less successful responses:

* tended to include details without connecting them to the proposition
* concentrated only on the early years of the Weimar Republic
* did not discuss the society and culture of the Weimar Republic
* focussed predominantly on economic and political factors.

Question 8

This was an extremely popular question.

More successful responses:

* clearly discussed and explained Germany’s problems and the Nazi policies that addressed them
* argued that Nazi policies combined with propaganda, effects of Nazi organisations on German life, use of violence and intimidation
* understood the ways that Nazi policies appealed to different social or economic groups
* used the concepts of social cohesion and ‘Volksgemeinschaft’ to explain growing support for the Nazi Party
* explained how Germany’s military and business elite contributed to the growth of the Party
* explained that support growth was slow to begin
* provided specific examples (e.g. Bauhaus, conservative values, attitudes and beliefs in rural regions, Zeittheatre) to support their points
* referred to responses from right and left-wing groups
* explained which German groups supported Nazi policies and why.

Less successful responses:

* did not specify particular Nazi policies
* little or no connection between Germany’s problems and the popularity of Nazi policies
* frequently used the term ‘changing culture and society’ without clarifying what it was
* wrote a seemingly prepared essays explaining the causes of the Nazis rise to power
* did not address the proposition in detail
* included events and factors after 1933
* agreed with the proposition but did not identify particular Nazi policies
* overstated the support for anti-Semitism in Germany between 1929-1933
* ignored the time frame of the proposition
* focussed on Hitler.

Question 9

More successful responses:

* carefully explained the increasing strength of Allied forces after the Battle of Stalingrad as a factor
* connected factors (e.g. bombing of cities and resource facilities, increasing Allied aerial dominance, destruction of communication and railway lines, Germany’s resources stretched across three fronts as the war progressed)
* considered the impact of the distance between Germany and occupied lands on access to resources.

Less successful responses:

* only discussed Germany’s resources shortages
* focussed only on tangible resources (e.g. coal, oil, iron ore, food)
* did not consider human resources
* provided discussion focussing on the final 12 months prior to surrender
* confused the time period between the First World War and the Second World War
* focussed on the Holocaust without connecting it to the proposition.

Question 10

There were too few responses to this question to provide meaningful feedback.

Question 11

There were few responses to this question.

More successful responses:

* identified changes in sports, arts, housing closing gulags.

Less successful responses:

* failed to clarify the Khrushchev Thaw
* confused Khrushchev with Gorbachev
* provided limited detail
* discussed generalised themes with limited examples or evidence.

Question 12

There were few responses to this question.

Less successful responses:

* failed to state the objectives of the August coup
* explained reasons for the collapse of the USSR without mention the attempted coup.

Question 13

There were few responses to this question.

More successful responses:

* showed perceptive understanding of the role of the PKI and international responses to it in Suharto’s rise
* didn’t address the proposition or discuss either leader.

Less successful responses:

* were completely narrative.

Question 14

There were few responses to this question.

More successful responses:

* showed a nuanced understanding of stability
* distinguished between political, economic and social stability

Question15

There were too few responses to this question to provide meaningful feedback.

Question 16

There were few responses to this question.

More successful responses:

* most responses considered the Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution with no connection to the proposition
* discussed the Mao era generally rather than develop an argument
* limited detail or evidence provided to support argument or counter-argument.

Less successful responses:

* provided only an argument or counter‑argument.

Question 17

There were very few responses to this question.

Less successful responses:

* discussion of the Four Modernisations didn’t not focus on the word ‘radical’.

Question 18

There were few responses to this question.

More successful responses:

* showed detailed knowledge of Deng Xiaoping’s reforms.

Less successful responses:

* included discussion limited to evidence and consideration of the ways Deng Xiaoping laid the foundation for economic success in China.

Sources Analysis

General comments

More successful analysis of sources:

* understood the questions and sources well
* responded with relevant detail to questions posed.
* provided sufficient detail to match the marks for each question
* considered the origin and nature of the sources in Question e as strengths and or weaknesses
* were clearly written
* showed sound understanding of key concepts in historical analysis: e.g. credibility, relevance, bias, perspective
* applied historical vocabulary effectively to assist their analysis of sources.

Less successful analysis of sources:

* misunderstood questions
* failed to apply evidence from sources to the questions asked
* showed little understanding of terms such as credibility, relevance and reliability.
* used historical vocabulary accurately, however, did not apply it to evidence in the sources provided, instead writing very general responses without details from the sources or their captions
* misunderstood some of the sources.

Question (a)

More successful responses:

* were succinct
* identified an opinion (e.g. inexperienced officers).

Less successful responses:

* were unnecessarily long
* quoted from the preamble.

Question (b)

More successful responses:

* responded succinctly yet clearly
* clearly identified two reasons (e.g. difficult terrain, enemy tactics).

Less successful responses

* claimed that the French army and their officers were external factors.

Question (c)

Most markers voiced concerns regarding responses to this question.

More successful responses:

* clearly stated two conclusions (e.g. Napoleon was arrogant, Napoleon underestimated the Duke of Wellington or the British troops)
* supported each conclusion with relevant evidence from the source
* clearly identified a conclusion, specifically by using language such as “A conclusion that can be drawn is…”

Less successful responses

* lacked evidence for the conclusions drawn
* only discussed the ways that Source 5 supported Source 4
* focussed on the genre of each source rather than their contents
* used direct comprehension to answer the question rather than forming a conclusion
* claimed Napoleon was the ‘supreme general of his time’ was a fact rather than Cromwell’s opinion.

Question (d)

More successful responses:

* included a statement indicating the extent to which the information in one source supported the information in the other source using terms such as large, considerable, slight
* contained both supported points and unsupported points
* showed both similarity and differences between the sources
* provided evidence and made connections rather than just stringing quotes from the sources together
* were clear and well-structured with two paragraphs including relevant quotes – one explaining how the sources supported each other, the other on how they didn’t.

Less successful responses:

* did not provide sufficient evidence to support their view
* lacked detail
* described how Source 4 supported Source 2
* either did not use evidence or used irrelevant evidence to support their position
* focussed on source type or genre rather than source content
* provided evidence of the degree of support that contradicted their stated judgement
* used terms like ‘an’, ‘some’ or ‘certain’ to rate the extent to which one source supported the other.

Question (e)

More successful responses:

* mentioned strengths and limitations for each source
* provided valid examples
* showed an understanding of the purpose of each source as well as content
* identified and explained any apparent inherent and/or intentional bias
* clearly articulated how the origin, nature and type of source affected its usefulness, and the way the perspective of the artist or the writer of the journal article affected the details in the source they created, and therefore the strengths and limitations
* identified how a source’s origin is recognised (e.g. the author, producer, place of publication, date of publication)
* were clearly structured, for example, in one paragraph:
* explained the origin and nature of Source 3
* explained a strength and limitation of Source 3 in relation to its origin and nature (with an example as needed)
* and in another paragraph, followed the same process for Source 6.

Less successful responses

* only mentioned strengths or limitations
* did not contain quotes or examples
* did not mention nature or origin
* stated that the podcast was not a credible source without justifying their statement
* claimed the sources were biased without explaining how
* claimed that Source 3 was a primary source because it contained quotes by Napoleon
* identified the nature and/or origin of the sources but didn’t recognise their inherent strengths and limitations in addition to those of their content
* generalised that the cartoon reflected the views of the French people regarding Napoleon
* claimed that Cromwell was an historian
* stated that the podcast slightly supported the cartoon yet described more ways that they supported each other than didn’t
* stated facts but didn’t explain whether they were strengths or limitations
* did not distinguish the difference between bias and biased, or that these two words are not interchangeable
* substituted limitations with weaknesses
* compared the sources.

Question (f)

More successful responses:

* contained a brief introduction and/or conclusion
* mentioned each source explicitly
* provided a clear and well-balanced response, integrating all the sources into their argument or counter-argument
* used an essay structure with an introduction, at least 2 body paragraphs (one with the argument and the other containing the counter-argument) and a conclusion
* were able to synthesise points supporting or opposing the proposition in a nuanced way
* distinguished between Napoleon and other French officers and troops as contributing to the French defeat in different ways.

Less successful responses

* did not create an argument, rather recounted how each source supported or opposed the proposition
* stated the extent to which the proposition was correct rather than the extent to which the sources supported or opposed it
* were unable to provide an overall conclusion when evaluating the proposition.