

Assessment Schedule – 2015

Scholarship: History (93403)

Skill 1: Historical ideas

Candidates should identify the key ideas about **significance / relevance / importance from their study of history, showing their understanding of the key ideas about history, historical evidence and narratives, and historical relationships** 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 the significance and relevance include:

- The relevance of history is not dependent on the proximity of time and place; a particular context/topic is significant in its own right / OR a topic lacks significance, as relevance has everything to do with time and place.
- The significance of historical events varies over time and from the perspectives of historical participants.
- Events, people, or developments in history have historical significance if they resulted in change that had deep consequences for people over a long period of time.
- The significance of events, people, or developments in history have historical significance if they reveal enduring or emerging issues and trends.
- Historical significance is constructed through historical narratives.
- History is significant and relevant because it allows us to investigate those who have been 'hidden' from history – women, those on the margins of society such as the poor, colonised peoples. The significance of history has changed since the development of social history and what Christopher Hill calls 'the worm's eye view' of the world. It is important to focus on ordinary people to try to understand what the people of a time experienced.
- The significance and relevance of history lies in the historiographical debates that force us to address questions about the nature of history itself, such as: can events be inevitable? Do people or forces precipitate events? What are the problems associated with hindsight? How do present-day perspectives colour our view of what has happened in the past?
- History is important in itself, but certain contexts have been so distorted and romanticised by movies, television series and documentaries, and novels that it is difficult to be balanced in our approach to it. All too often the focus of the period is the drama and the glamour of a period, which gives us an incomplete picture.
- History is significant today, but to make parallels between a historical time and the present day is overly simplistic. 'The past is another country' that we can barely understand.
- History is relevant and important because it may teach political lessons.
- History is relevant and important, as historical events and developments have been said to influence national identity.

Ideas from the sources that candidates might include:

In **Source A**, Stephen Fry argues that history matters, and what's more, the public holds a growing interest in it. He argues, however, that it is vital that people imaginatively enter into the past, even if it seems out of reach and unpalatable to us, so that we see ourselves in the past.

In **Source B**, Barbara Tuchman writes that history does not serve a utilitarian function; historical evidence cannot be adequately quantified and is based, unlike the sciences, on variable human experience in the past. She reminds us that the behaviour of people plays a crucial role in history, and is much more complex, multi-faceted, and dynamic than simply inputting data. Thus, history itself does not teach straightforward lessons. Candidates could argue that history has less to do with individuals and their behavior than the complex interaction between social, economic, and political forces.

In **Source C1**, Jason Burke describes how war correspondents benefit from a knowledge of history, and how later historians might benefit from their work in turn.

The cartoon in **Source C2** plays on the phrase 'the iron curtain', coined by Winston Churchill to describe the Soviet occupation of eastern Europe by 1947, and the separation between the Warsaw Pact

countries and those connected to NATO. The message of the cartoon is that Putin is behaving as Stalin did in building this 'iron' barrier, and that Europe is once again threatened by dangerous division.

In **Source C3**, John Warren argues that history does not teach simple political lessons, although the historian should expose 'dangerous myths' by understanding the historical context behind events and developments and those in power should have a firm understanding of the historical background behind the countries they are dealing with. History does not teach simplistic lessons.

Source D focuses on how events are remembered at the time and over the years. In **Source D1**, Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt, the three leaders of the Great Powers in 1945, pledged a new era in world history of peace and understanding. However, it is made clear by the historian Lawrence Rees in **Source D2** that World War Two and the Holocaust were interpreted differently by the Soviet Union and the Western powers, and that it has taken 70 years for a historical consensus to be reached about the significance of the Holocaust. Candidates could argue that such a consensus is only on the surface. **Source D3** is an extract from a speech given by the German President Joachim Gauck at the 70th commemoration of the liberation of Auschwitz. He speaks of the lasting legacy of the Holocaust on German history.

Sources E1 and E2 focus on Samuel Marsden's arrival in Rangihoua in 1814, and the unveiling of the Marsden Cross in 1907 as a commemoration of the first Christian service in New Zealand held on Christmas Day in 1814. **Sources E3 and E4** are more recent representations of the significance of Samuel Marsden and the first Christian service in New Zealand's history.

In **Source F1**, New Zealand journalist Finlay Macdonald discusses the emotional and spiritual attachment many New Zealanders have to the tradition of ANZAC Day and to remembering the battle for Gallipoli. This is in spite of the contested nature of the event and the irony that New Zealand's involvement in World War One had little to do with ideals of freedom and democracy. The photographs in **Source F2** help to convey the historical myth behind Gallipoli, that of 'mateship', a myth that became a powerful stimulus for national feeling, especially amongst the soldiers. The 8-month campaign, however, was an ignominious defeat, as suggested by the makeshift nature of the evacuation. The traditional idea that Gallipoli established New Zealand's national identity is argued by the New Zealand military historian Christopher Pugsley in **Source F3**. This view could be challenged by candidates, as it has been contested by the historian Stevan Eldred-Grigg, who questions whether all New Zealanders established a sense of national identity during and after war. He also questions whether it was empire rather than national identity that was of significance to New Zealanders.

Source G1 continues on the theme of the contested significance of Gallipoli in New Zealand History. Dr Danny Keenan, a Māori historian, argues that the battle for Rangiriri is of greater significance for New Zealanders as a nation, and Māori in particular. The creation of the New Zealand nation was forged during the New Zealand Wars, not during a war for empire about which Māori were divided. **Source G2** is a cartoon by William Blomfield which conveys the Eurocentric view that Māori were first of all united in wanting to fight overseas enemies such as the Turks and secondly, that Māori were by nature warriors and that Gallipoli was as significant for them as it was for Pākehā.

Source H1 is an article by Professor Paul Moon written on the 175th commemoration of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi. He argues that the significance of the Treaty of Waitangi has changed over the years, and that in the post-colonial context, the relevance of the Treaty can be challenged. A post-colonial New Zealand will see more active demands for Māori sovereignty in aspects such as health, justice, and education. **Source H2** is a cartoon by Tom Scott, which uses irony to comment on the different views Māori and the Crown hold about the Treaty and to convey the continuing significance of the Treaty of Waitangi. **Source H3** is a poem by the New Zealand poet Brian Turner showing he resents the way New Zealanders have twisted the history of the contacts between Māori and Pākehā, and urging us to consider the past with more dignity. The poem also raises questions about the merits of the Treaty claims process.

Source I1 is an extract from the historian E. H. Carr's book *What is History?* published in 1961. Despite many historians valuing the insightful ideas in the book, Carr betrays a bias towards written history and denies the significance of the history of those who have been 'hidden' or 'forgotten', for example, women, indigenous peoples, and the poor, for whom written records are lacking. Historians Tim Mason and

Richard Evans in **Sources I2 and I3** both challenge Carr's approach to history, which they argue is old-fashioned and does not reflect the ways in which the study of history has changed over the twentieth century.

In **Source J1**, historian Jane Robinson argues that women are too often portrayed as 'emblems or caricatures' in history books – this amounts to the 'anonymous treatment of women's history' which should be challenged. In **Source J2**, the Tudor historian Eric Ives argues that it is difficult to write about a figure like Anne Boleyn as the evidence is 'opaque'. Nevertheless, he does judge her, in twenty-first century terms. Candidates could challenge this presentist interpretation of a key figure in early modern England whose significance has been greatly contested.

The Sources in K focus on the history of women in New Zealand after they gained the suffrage in 1893. **Source K1** is an infographic overview of the achievements of New Zealand women. **Source K2** is a recent press release on how the granting of women's suffrage through the efforts of Kate Sheppard and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) is made relevant to the people of Wellington.

Source L discusses how an event such as the march on Selma in 1965 is made relevant to people today through movies. **Source L1** asks questions about the reliability of a movie conveying an important historical moment. The director of *Selma* argues that personal perspectives change the way history is perceived and that we should not manipulate the reputation of historical figures such as President Johnson to make him into a hero. **Source L2** is an image of a movie poster for Selma that uses a photograph of the actor playing Martin Luther King Jr and the words 'One dream can change the world' in reference to King's 'I have a dream' speech in 1963, interpreting that what happened at Selma was due to the power of King himself. It raises questions about the interpretation of events, how evidence can be distorted and how events should be remembered. **Source L3** is an extract from the speech that President Obama gave at the 50-year commemoration of the march in Selma. The photograph (**Source L4**) shows President Obama and the Selma activists walking on the very bridge that saw the events of Bloody Sunday.

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 used their *perceptive and insightful* understanding of the key ideas through an informed understanding of the context. This will be sustained.
2. A candidate who gains 5 or 6 marks for this skill will have a highly developed understanding of the key ideas, to demonstrate an informed understanding of the context. A candidate on 5 marks will have some explanation but may lack clarity.
3. A candidate gaining either 3 or 4 marks will have identified some of the key ideas. For 3 marks, key ideas will be identified only; candidates on 4 marks will have attempted to explain the key ideas.
4. A candidate gaining 1 mark will not identify any key idea(s), while a candidate on 2 marks will have attempted to identify key idea(s).

Skill 2: Argument

Candidates should communicate their own substantive argument **EITHER on the extent to which history is significant / relevant / important because it** "flashes beacon lights along the way and ... is a useful remedy against despair." **OR on the extent to which history is significant / relevant / important because** of its "enigmatic lessons" where "nothing changes and yet everything is completely different." Candidates must refer to the sources and add their own knowledge in order to demonstrate a broad, deep, and balanced understanding of historians' different interpretations.

Candidates will be able to advance their argument clearly, fluently, and logically, establishing their position for their chosen question. They should:

1. define what is significance OR relevance OR importance of history
2. argue whether or not history is significant or relevant or important

3. identify and explain the extent to which historical events and developments are significant / relevant / important
4. acknowledge that the nature of significance / relevance / importance will change over time and according to different groups
5. identify and explain the ways that society responds to the changing significance / relevance / importance of history
6. evaluate the degree of significance / relevance / importance.

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 sophisticated and substantiated demonstrating breadth, depth, and balanced coverage will gain 7 or 8 marks. Candidates on 8 marks will have shown greater sophistication than a candidate on 7 marks.
2. For 5 or 6 marks, a candidate will have communicated a logical and convincing argument. A candidate on 6 marks will write a mostly balanced argument. Where the argument is not necessarily consistent and/or may waver, it is more likely to be 5 marks.
3. A candidate who has communicated a relatively simple argument will be on 3 or 4 marks. Where the argument has inconsistencies or inaccuracies, the candidate will be on 3 marks. Where the argument may be simple but explicit, the candidate will gain 4 marks.
4. A candidate who is awarded 1 or 2 mark(s) will have made an attempt to communicate an argument. A candidate on 1 mark will have written less than the candidate on 2 marks.

Skill 3: Synthesis

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 have synthesised their *highly developed knowledge with ideas in the sources* with insight. A candidate gaining 8 marks will have integrated in a more sophisticated manner.
2. A candidate who gains 5 or 6 marks for this skill will synthesise a highly developed knowledge with ideas from the sources. A candidate gaining 6 marks will have a balanced integration of their own knowledge with the sources. A candidate gaining 5 marks will have a clear, informed integration that may not be consistent or clearly expressed.
3. A candidate gaining either 3 marks or 4 marks will have integrated ideas from the sources and their own knowledge. Candidates who take a source-by-source approach, and don't integrate the sources and their own knowledge, will get a maximum of 3 marks. A candidate will have integrated some of their own knowledge for 4 marks.
4. A candidate gaining 2 marks will have attempted to integrate their own knowledge with ideas in the sources. A candidate on 1 mark will not have integrated their own knowledge.

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 the significance / relevance / importance of the study of history.

- **Cause and effect:** Candidates should discuss the impact of events on creating national identity and political change and memory.

- **Continuity and change:** Candidates might discuss the extent to which the significance and relevance of history changes over time.
- **Past and present:** Candidates might ask the following questions in relation to different historical interpretations: How does presentism influence the writing of history? – particularly discussions about changing roles for women, the impact of colonialism on indigenous peoples and the contribution to national identity; How history resonates in current events? How are wars remembered today? How should they be commemorated?
- **Patterns and trends:** Candidates could note that the present day trend to glorify and commercialise events and people in history; the ongoing trend of remembering and valuing history; commemorations of key events suggest a trend of looking at the past in a simplistic way.
- **Specific and general:** Candidates might refer to sources that emphasise individual stories and the impact of an event on history. Candidates should take into consideration the problem of looking at singular events to measure whether history is significant and/or relevant.

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 demonstrated a perceptive and insightful understanding of historical relationships through the convincing use of examples from their own knowledge. This will be sophisticated for 8 marks.
2. A candidate who gains 5 or 6 marks will have a highly developed understanding of historical relationships and will have brought in examples from their own knowledge. A candidate who lacks clarity of explanation will gain 5 marks.
3. A candidate gaining either 3 marks or 4 marks will have accurately identified some of the historical relationships. A candidate gaining 3 marks will be implicit or will have identified some relationships but not always accurately.
4. A candidate gaining 2 marks is likely to have attempted to include the historical relationships. The candidate on 1 mark will have missed identifying historical relationships.

Skill 5: Judgement

Candidates must refer to the sources and add their own knowledge to make judgements about the **nature of evidence**. Ideas from the sources that candidates might include:

- Commenting on the extent to which Stephen Fry is an appropriate person to be questioning whether or not history matters.
- Commenting on the reliability and limitations of speeches, such as **Source L3 and D3**.
- Commenting on the problems of reliability of primary sources such as newspaper article in **Source E1** and the extract from the news magazine from the Anglican Church in **Source E3** and the Wellington City Council press release in **Source K2** and the official statement from the Yalta conference in **Source D1**.
- Acknowledging the bias of the cartoonists in **Sources C2, G2, and H2**. Candidates could also question the value of a cartoon as evidence of historical significance or relevance.
- Commenting on the usefulness of the statistics presented in **Source K1**, or on the limitations of the statistics, and the need to compare them with other evidence.
- Identifying the problem of interview, such as the one of Ava DuVernay in **Source L1**. However, this source also demonstrates the importance of perspectives in the histories of minority groups, whose participation in historical events is often under-represented.
- Commenting on the usefulness of poems, such as that in **Source H3**. How significant, relevant, or reliable is it?
- Commenting on the nature of the painting in **Source E4**. Who might have been the intended audience of this source? What is the purpose of this painting?

- Questioning the evidence of Christopher Pugsley in **Source F3**, where he writes that ANZAC Day was the touchstone of New Zealand identity. “Gallipoli has etched its mark.”
- Questioning the usefulness of the photographs in **Sources E2, F2, K2, and L4**.
- Commenting on the need for more specific evidence from the source selection.

The candidate must refer to the sources, and add their own knowledge, to make judgements about the **strengths and limitations** of historians’ narratives. Using the sources, the candidate might:

- Acknowledge the argument of Tuchman in **Source B**, that history is not a science and that scientific methods are of little use in creating history, as it deals with the complexity of people. She also says that history does not teach us lessons. Compare and contrast this view with that of John Warren in **Source C3**.
- Compare and contrast the views of Danny Keenan with those of Christopher Pugsley on the significance and relevance of Gallipoli in forming New Zealand’s national identity. Candidates might also comment on the fact that Keenan is a Māori historian and Pugsley is a military historian.
- Recognise the limitations of journalists’ viewpoints and also their usefulness in **Sources C1 and F1**.
- Comment on how history can be distorted as outlined by Lawrence Rees in **Source D2**.
- Compare and contrast the views of E.H. Carr, Tim Mason, and Richard Evans in **Source I** on those who have been ‘forgotten by history’.
- Compare and contrast the approaches of Jane Robinson and Eric Ives in dealing with gender history.

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 make *perceptive judgments* about the historical narratives/writers’ views, and the nature of historical evidence in the sources provided. They will bring in their own knowledge to make these judgements. The perceptive judgements need to be sustained, and may emphasise narratives more than the nature of evidence, or visa versa. For 8 marks, this will be sophisticated.
2. A candidate who gains 5 or 6 marks will make *highly developed judgements* about the historical narratives/writers’ views, and/or the nature of historical evidence in the sources provided. They will bring in their own knowledge to make these judgements. For 6 marks, candidates will show more critical analysis. For 5 marks candidates might refer to the sources in the paper only but are critical.
3. A candidate who gains 3 or 4 marks must accurately use the historical narratives/writers’ views, and/or make some simple judgements about the nature of historical evidence in the sources provided. For 3 marks, the candidate must have made ONE valid judgement about either a source or historian/writers view; 4 marks is more than one valid judgement. These valid judgements 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 has referred to historical narratives/writers, and/or has attempted to make a judgment about the sources. One valid attempt at a judgement will receive 2 marks, a glimmer of an attempt will receive 1 mark.

Candidate No.: _____ Question: *One or Two*

<p>Historical ideas (Skill No. 1)</p> <p><i>Analyse and think critically about key ideas relevant to the historical context and setting, using:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • perceptive understanding of key ideas (sustained), PD1 (8 or 7) • highly developed and informed understanding of key ideas, PD2 (6 or 5) • identifies key ideas, PD3 (4 or 3) • attempts to identify key ideas, PD4 (2 or 1). 	<p>Argument (Skill No. 2)</p> <p><i>Logical development, precision and clarity of ideas require the communication of a substantiated argument within an effective written format, using:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sophisticated and substantiated argument, PD1 (8 or 7) • logical, convincing, and balanced argument, PD2 (6 or 5) • simple and explicit argument, PD3 (4 or 3) • attempts to communicate an argument, PD4 (2 or 1).
<p>Synthesis of ideas (Skill No. 3)</p> <p><i>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), by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • insightfully synthesising a highly developed knowledge with ideas in the sources, PD1 (8 or 7) • integrating a highly developed knowledge with ideas in the sources, PD2 (6 or 5) • integrating ideas from the sources with some knowledge, PD3 (4 or 3) • attempting to integrate ideas and a little knowledge, PD4 (2 or 1). 	<p>Historical relationships (Skill No. 4)</p> <p><i>Evaluate historical relationships, such as cause and effect, continuity and change, past and present, specific and general, patterns and trends, using:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • perceptive understanding of historical relationships and convincing use of examples, PD1 (8 or 7) • highly developed understanding of historical relationships with informed examples, PD2 (6 or 5) • identifies some historical relationships, PD3 (4 or 3) • attempts to identify historical relationships, PD4 (2 or 1).
<p>Judgements about evidence / narratives (Skill No. 5)</p> <p><i>Judge the reliability and usefulness of historical evidence, and evaluate the strengths and limitations of historians' narratives, using:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • perceptive judgements of narratives and the nature of evidence (sustained and sophisticated), PD1 (8 or 7) • highly developed judgements of narratives and / or the nature of evidence, PD2 (6 or 5) • accurate use of narratives and / or makes simple judgements about the nature of evidence, PD3 (4 or 3) • references to historical narratives, or the nature of evidence in the sources, PD4 (2 or 1). 	

Total score: / 40