

## Assessment Schedule – 2013

### Scholarship: History (93403)

#### Skill 1: Historical ideas

Candidates should identify the key ideas about **historians' different interpretations** from the evidence in the sources and their own knowledge and use these ideas to develop their argument. They should not merely paraphrase the sources. They are required to use a minimum of six sources. Key ideas about historians' different interpretations include:

- what is history
- what is the study of history
- what does it mean to study history
- what is a fact
- how do historians select facts
- what is evidence
- how do historians select evidence
- problems with evidence
- schools of historical thought eg history as progress; the place of women and history; Marxism; postmodernism
- the influence of the time period in which historians are writing
- the problem of presentism
- the influence of national identity
- memory versus history
- the role that grievances play in the recording of history
- historical truth versus interpretation.

#### Ideas from the sources that candidates might include:

**Source A** contains a painting that depicts the problematic nature of the work of an historian. The text of the source summarises what it means to be an historian and the difficulties that historians face attempting not to let the present or the future influence their interpretation of the past. It also argues that a true understanding of the events of history are inaccessible; that we can never fully understand what happened in the past, historians can only do their best to represent the events of history and, therefore, the events of the past can never really be fully understood and historians will never agree about what exactly happened.

**Source B** argues that because history is the study of people, historians cannot help but make some kind of moral judgement in their presentation of the past. It argues that historians can't escape thinking about history in moral terms and should not attempt to. The source summarises Gaddis' view that historians must make judgements responsibly but that we must accept that any judgements any historian applies to the past can't help but reflect the present the historian inhabits.

**Source C** outlines the theory of postmodernism in history. Since the early 1970s, postmodernism and critical theory have attacked the authority of historians and undermined their claims to be able to say anything 'true' about the past. Postmodernists believe the practice of history is an academic ritual: a personal selection of subjective inferences drawn from a small sample of artificially constructed facts, purveyed own prejudices, and no more meaningful than historical fiction. But historians have to try to explain the past as people want to know about it. Ian Mortimer argues that historians shouldn't judge the actions of the people in the past; that there is no purpose in it. The only purpose of history is to reveal human nature.

**Source D** introduces the problematic nature of the study of history. It suggests that on one level it is impossible to uncover the past as it has gone and is therefore out of reach. But if we really examine what people in the past saw, heard, felt, tasted, then we can get closer to seeing humanity in a new light.

**Source E** argues that historical facts never exist in a 'pure' form, that facts are subject to the mind of the historian. In order to understand history, it is necessary first to study the mind of the historian because history means interpretation.

**Source F** argues that historical facts are artificial constructs of a number of individual facts. It suggests that historians use facts to construct the nature of historical events as they want to see them. We have to understand the historian's overall viewpoint and understand, in general terms, how the selection of facts has been made.

**Source G1** argues that prior to 1989, Universal Histories of mankind were nothing more than histories of the development of freedom. Fukuyama argues that given the political, economic, and social developments that occurred in 1989, it is impossible for the world to improve in terms of freedom and therefore the study of history, with the end of the Cold War, has come to an end. This is a view that sees history as a road to 'progress'. **Source G2** argues from a Marxist historian's point of view that the end of the Cold War marked the end of a significant era and so a significant era in historical interpretation, but it certainly did not mean the end of 'history' or the high point of progress – 'problems of another kind' were already in evidence.

**Source H1** outlines President Medvedev of Russia's establishment of a Commission to counter what he and the Russian government considered to be the falsification of Russian history in an attempt to stop it from becoming 'increasingly severe and aggressive'. Historian Robert Service challenges Medvedev, saying that Medvedev is attempting to control history in order to control the present and to prevent historians from making Russia look anything but heroic in her fight against Nazi Germany. **Source H2** argues that the Japanese government does not allow a 'complete' history of Japanese involvement in world events to be taught in Japanese schools and therefore Japanese people have a limited view of such events as the invasion of Manchuria and what is referred to as the Rape of Nanjing.

**Source I** is a speech given by novelist Hilary Mantel about the study of royal figures. She argues that historians have typically distorted women in history when they have written about them. She suggests that as with popular fiction, historians have used the writing of the history of such women as Anne Boleyn and Wallis Simpson as a form of moral teaching about women's lives and that the moral lesson taught depends on the moral fashion of the time period that the historian is writing in.

**Source J** introduces the problem of evidence to accurate historical interpretation. It outlines the fact that there is little evidence of Anne Boleyn's life and that historians must be careful in such instances not to speculate and must instead employ sound arguments, clear and careful analysis, and balanced discussion of views devoid of personal opinion and present-day values.

**Sources K1–K4** provide an overview of women's absence from history. **Source K1** introduces the idea that women have tended to be presented in the private, domestic sphere rather than the public sphere of politics and economics and that the move to write women into the public sphere of history has been slow. **Source K2** (written in 1989) is from a feminist's point of view and argues that male supremacy has been written into history as a means of subordinating women. **Source K3** (written in 1982) argues that women have been left out of history because history has been considered only in male-centred terms. **K4** is from a novelist's point of view (written in 1929) that supports the idea that women have not been adequately represented in history.

**Source L** is a poem written from a worker's point of view about the absence of the workers' perspectives of historical events / the absence of 'history from below', ie history does not represent the workers who built great monuments, the lives of slaves, the experience of foot soldiers, etc.

**Source M** summarises the views of historians on the discovery of the remains of Richard III found under a Leicester car park in 2011. These accounts demonstrate the importance of historical evidence and the changing nature of historical evidence to historical argument. It also raises questions about the significance of developing technology to the way in which historical evidence is gathered.

**Source N1** introduces the idea that it is problematic when history is used as a tool to add credence to events and issues in the present. It argues that the life and actions of Abraham Lincoln have been used over time to support such issues as communism, feminism, prohibitionism, and vegetarianism. The source questions the reliability of history when it is manipulated to establish meaning and purpose in a modern context. It also outlines the importance of primary evidence to the accurate representation of the past. **Source N2** is an image of a book cover that uses a photograph of an actor in a film about Abraham Lincoln instead of an image of Abraham Lincoln himself. It raises questions about the manipulation of

evidence, why evidence is manipulated, why we study history and the inaccuracy of evidence. It supports the ideas in **Source N1**.

**Sources O1 and O2** are photographs which have been used in the past to present a particular view. **Source O1** is a photograph of Ngātau Omahuru, the son of Hinewai and Te Karere Omahuru of Ngā Ruahine in Taranaki, who was captured by colonial forces in 1868 during the New Zealand Wars, at the age of six. The photograph depicts 'Fox Boy' as he came to be known while he was living with Pākehā, and he is dressed as a Pākehā child of this age might have been dressed at this time. It suggests that he has been fully 'assimilated' into the Pākehā culture, and supports the Pākehā government's assimilationist policy of the late 19th century. **Source O2** is a famous photo of 'Truganini', a Tasmanian Aboriginal woman whose parents were killed by colonists and who was imprisoned on Flinders Island as part of their assimilation policy. The title, *Last of the full-blood Tasmanian Aboriginals*, is greatly misleading as her descendants continued to live away from their tribal lands on the islands to the north of Tasmania. These sources raise questions about the problems of historical evidence.

### **Skill 1 Performance descriptor**

Analyse and think critically about key ideas relevant to the historical context(s) and setting(s)

#### **Explanatory notes**

1. A candidate who gains 7 or 8 marks for this skill will demonstrate that they have *analysed* the sources provided and *thought critically* about the *context* in order to evaluate *relevant key ideas*. They will use their own knowledge and the sources provided in order to enhance their argument.
2. A candidate who gains 5 or 6 marks for this skill will demonstrate a *perceptive and insightful* understanding of the sources provided and evidence that they have thought critically about the context in order to evaluate relevant key ideas. They will use their own knowledge and the sources provided in order to enhance their argument.
3. A candidate gaining either 3 or 4 marks is likely to have identified some of the key ideas. They will have brought in a little bit of their own knowledge and/or have provided some decent paraphrasing of the sources into their article.
4. A candidate gaining either 1 or 2 marks would fail to either identify the key ideas or use any/much of their own knowledge; or would make little or no reference to the sources provided.

### **Skill 2: Argument**

Scholarship candidates should select ONE question and communicate their own substantive argument **on the extent to which truth is difficult to prove in history and whether or not it follows that all versions are equally acceptable OR on the extent to which it is possible for historians to show objectively what actually happened in the past**. Candidates must refer to the sources and add their own knowledge of a topic (from study) in order to demonstrate a broad, deep, and balanced understanding of historians' different interpretations.

#### **Question One**

Scholarship candidates will be able to advance clearly, fluently, and logically their argument that establishes their position on **the extent to which truth is difficult to prove in history and whether or not it follows that all versions are equally acceptable**. They should:

1. Define what historical truth is.
2. Argue whether or not historical truth exists and if it is difficult to prove based on the availability and nature of evidence as well as the influence of the historian's interpretation of evidence.
3. Identify and explain the extent of their position on how difficult it is to prove historical truth.
4. Acknowledge that versions of historical events differ and explain why.
5. Identify and explain what it means for versions of history to be acceptable.
6. Identify their position on the extent to which it follows that all versions of history are equally acceptable.

## Question Two

Scholarship candidates will be able to advance clearly, fluently, and logically their argument that establishes their position on **the extent to which it is possible for historians to show objectively what actually happened in the past**. They should:

1. Define what objectivity is in history.
2. Argue whether or not it is possible to have any 'objective truth' (Keith Jenkins) in history given the availability and nature of evidence or whether it is useful for historians even to pursue such an aim.
3. Identify and explain what an historical fact is and whether pursuing historical facts is the main task of an historian.
4. Identify and explain the extent of their position on how far historians should pursue objectivity given that all historians have their own interpretations or 'biases' that influence their choice of 'facts'.
5. Acknowledge that the scope of evidence has greatly expanded over the last and this century, as have the subjects that historians are interested in.
6. Identify and explain how versions of historical events differ, and explain why.

### Skill 2 Performance descriptor

Logical development, precision and clarity of ideas require the communication of a substantiated argument within an effective written format.

#### *Explanatory notes*

1. Candidates whose arguments are *substantiated* (7 or 8 marks) will have *logically and clearly* developed their ideas. They will have demonstrated this *effectively* through literacy, fluency, insight, elegance, flair, complexity and/or originality. The response to the issue has breadth, depth, and balanced coverage.
2. A candidate will have communicated a *sophisticated* argument by developing a *discerning* and *balanced* argument supported by evidence from the sources and/or their own knowledge (5 or 6 marks).
3. A candidate who has communicated a relatively simple argument that is not always supported by evidence, or where the argument is in the background rather than explicit (3 or 4 marks).
4. A candidate who is awarded 1 or 2 mark(s) has made an attempt to communicate an argument or has written a competent accurate narrative.

## Skill 3: Synthesis

Scholarship candidates must integrate the ideas from the sources and their own content knowledge to communicate their argument effectively. (See possible ideas and content for Skills 1 and 2.)

### Skill 3 Performance descriptor

Use highly developed knowledge, historical ideas and skills to develop an argument which demonstrates an understanding of a complex historical context(s) and setting(s).

#### *Explanatory notes*

1. A candidate who gains 7 or 8 marks for this skill will use *highly developed knowledge, historical ideas and skills* to develop their argument.
2. A candidate who gains 5 or 6 marks will show breadth and depth of understanding, historical ideas and skills to *develop a discerning, balanced* argument.
3. A candidate gaining either 3 marks or 4 marks is likely to have brought in a little bit of their own knowledge and/or have provided some decent paraphrasing of the sources into their article. Candidates who take a source-by-source approach, and don't integrate the evidence from the sources into a well-structured argument, will fall into this category as they will not have demonstrated the skill of synthesis.
4. A candidate gaining either 1 or 2 marks would either fail to use any/much of their own knowledge or make little or no reference to the sources provided.

## Skill 4: Historical relationships

Candidates must refer to the sources and add their own knowledge in order to demonstrate an awareness of some of the following historical relationships in the context of different historical interpretations.

- **Cause and effect:** Candidates should discuss the influence of the background / school of thought of the historian on their argument and the quality of the evidence available for interpretation. Candidates could ask the following questions: What determines how historians select evidence and describe / interpret or analyse events? How are causal connections between events established in history? History is also subject to the way in which it is presented by institutions such as publishing companies, governments, and schools. Sources A, B, C, G, J, H, N1 and N2, K1–4, and M could prove useful for discussion.
- **Continuity and change:** Candidates should discuss the extent to which interpretations of topics they have studied have remained the same or changed. The influence of the present and the future in changing interpretations should be discussed. Candidates could ask the question: What problems are posed for the study of history when new evidence emerges? Sources G1 and 2, J, and N1 might be useful here.
- **Past and present:** Candidates might ask the following questions in relation to different historical interpretations. How does presentism influence the writing of history? How far has technology aided or affected the study of history? Reference to Sources O1 and O2, N1 and N2, K1–4, and L might be useful.
- **Patterns and trends:** Candidates could note that Sources C, G1 and G2 discuss the way that the study of history has developed over the years, and the changes that history as an academic subject has undergone along with the corresponding changes in oral history. Postmodernism should be discussed. Candidates could ask the questions: How do we study history, why do we study history anyway?

### Skill 4 Performance descriptor

Evaluate historical relationships such as cause and effect, continuity and change, past and present, specific and general, patterns and trends.

### Explanatory notes

1. A candidate who gains 7 or 8 marks for this skill will have *analysed* the sources provided and *thought critically* about the context in order to evaluate historical relationships. This could be explicit or implicit.
2. A candidate who gains 5 or 6 marks will have used *perception and insight* to demonstrate their understanding of the historical relationships. This could be explicit or implicit.
3. A candidate gaining either 3 marks or 4 marks is likely to have included the historical relationships but may not have included supporting evidence. This could be explicit or implicit.
4. A candidate gaining either 1 or 2 marks is likely to have attempted to include the historical relationships. This could be explicit or implicit.

## Skill 5: Judgement

Candidates must refer to the sources and add their own knowledge to make judgements about the nature of evidence and must evaluate the strengths and limitations of historians' narratives. Ideas from the sources that candidates might include are:

- A discussion about what history is / how historians use evidence / the problematic nature of the study of history. All of the sources provided should prove useful for discussion.
- Comments on the need for more specific evidence from the source selection about different schools of thought.
- A discussion on the nature of the evidence provided. For example, what is the purpose of the speech given by Hilary Mantel in Source I, the poem in Source L, the book cover in Source N2, the

photographs in Sources O1 and O2. Who might have been the intended audience of each of these sources?

- Comment on the representativeness, usefulness, and reliability of these sources as evidence.

### **Skill 5 Performance descriptor**

Judge the reliability and usefulness of historical evidence and evaluate the strengths and limitations of historians' narratives.

### ***Explanatory notes***

1. A candidate who gains 7 or 8 marks will need to consistently make judgements about the sources and historical narratives in relation to the context and explain why they have made these judgements. To reach this category, these judgements would need to be *analytical* and show a *critical* understanding about the nature of the context or the perspective of the historian and / or the contemporary. This evaluation needs to be sustained.
2. A candidate who gains 5 or 6 marks will make *perceptive and insightful judgements* about the sources and perspective of the historian / contemporary in relation to the context. This means that their judgements need to be accurate and based on their informed knowledge of the historical issue.
3. A candidate who gains 3 or 4 must correctly and accurately use the views of historians and / or contemporaries in his / her argument and make some simple judgements about the validity of these views. They will also have made some simple or obvious but valid judgements about the nature of the historical evidence available to them as they address the historical issue. They are likely to use phrases such as 'limitation', 'reliability', 'validity', 'usefulness', 'bias', 'propaganda', 'selection', 'appropriate', 'representative', etc.
4. A candidate who gains either 1 or 2 marks will have used the historians' arguments or made at least one genuine attempt to evaluate historical narratives or contemporary accounts concerning the historical issue and must have attempted to make a judgement about the sources.