

**Assessment Schedule – 2022****Scholarship History (93403)**

Candidate answers THREE questions. Each response is marked out of 8 against the descriptors for the History Scholarship Standard.

**Schedule 1: Criteria for Question One**

<b>Outstanding Scholarship</b>	<p><b>7</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addresses the question directly, demonstrating a thorough understanding of its scope.</li> <li>Constructs a convincing argument well supported by a range of evidence.</li> <li>Evaluates the source material in an insightful manner.</li> <li>Demonstrates a high level of understanding of historical narratives and evaluation of historical evidence.</li> <li>Provides a thoughtful discussion of how reliability and usefulness can be determined.</li> </ul>	<p><b>8</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addresses the question directly, demonstrating a thorough and informed understanding of its scope.</li> <li>Constructs a substantiated argument integrating a wide range of evidence from sources and the candidate's own understanding of historical narratives insightfully and coherently.</li> <li>Includes perceptive and sophisticated evaluation of evidence from several sources, including an understanding of the possible limitations of historical evidence.</li> <li>Provides an informed discussion of how reliability and usefulness can be determined.</li> </ul>
<b>Scholarship</b>	<p><b>5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responds to the question in a concise and clear manner.</li> <li>Constructs an argument supported by the source material.</li> <li>Shows a limited but effective awareness of other historical narratives.</li> <li>Demonstrates an ability to evaluate the source material.</li> </ul>	<p><b>6</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addresses the question concisely and consistently.</li> <li>Constructs a substantiated argument drawing on a range of sources and the candidate's own knowledge.</li> <li>Demonstrates an awareness of other historical narratives, adding a degree of complexity to the answer.</li> <li>Makes valid judgements about several of the sources.</li> </ul>
<b>Below Scholarship</b>	<p><b>3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attempts to develop an argument but does not address the question.</li> <li>Demonstrates some understanding of historical narratives.</li> <li>Ignores the question but demonstrates a detailed understanding of historical narratives.</li> <li>Compares / contrasts the sources as a way of attempting to support the resulting argument.</li> <li>Provides a judgement about the way in which historians agree / disagree.</li> <li>Makes a valid judgement of historical evidence though any conclusion is limited and superficial.</li> <li>Constructs an argument based on generalities and with a limited engagement with the source material.</li> </ul>	<p><b>4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attempts to respond to the question but lacks a consistent argument.</li> <li>Supports the argument with appropriate examples.</li> <li>Makes at least one valid and detailed judgement as to the usefulness / limitation / reliability of the sources.</li> <li>Includes the integration of their own knowledge of historical narratives.</li> <li>Shows a limited understanding of the ideas underpinning historical narratives.</li> <li>Relies on prior knowledge which lessens the effectiveness of the candidate's argument.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not address the question.</li> <li>Shows little understanding of historical narratives.</li> </ul>	<p><b>2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attempts to answer the question in a limited and perfunctory way.</li> <li>Comments on the sources by comparing one source with another or evaluates the sources in a superficial way.</li> <li>Shows limited understanding of historical narratives.</li> </ul>

## Examples of possible approaches to Question One

**To what extent do Sources A–H enable historians to argue that race plays an important role in the shaping of nationalism?**

### Evidence

The use of “to what extent” in the question invites the candidate to evaluate the role of race in its possible relationship with nationalism. This process of evaluation, of weighing up the possibilities suggested in the question, and the acknowledgement of ‘important’ as a way of defining and redefining the factor(s) that could create nationalism, should allow the candidate to respond to the question appropriately.

The candidate could construct their answer by:

- defining and / or examining the concepts of race and nationalism
- arguing the importance of race in the construction of ideas around this notion of nationalism
- arguing that there are other ideas / concepts to be considered: religion, culture, language, patriotism, etc
- arguing that race no longer plays a pivotal role in the shaping of nationalism
- arguing that in a world where globalisation exerts a powerful influence, ideas of nationalism and race are relics of a previous age
- using the ideas and arguments of historians whose views are not included in the source material
- arguing the importance of ‘Social Darwinism’ as a continuing factor in the relationship between nationalism and race, or how this idea no longer has the importance it once enjoyed.

Ideas from the sources could include:

**Source A:** Anthony D. Smith gives a summary of Eric Hobsbawm’s description of nationalism, noting several stages of the development of this historical force. In describing some of the changing characteristics of nationalism, a conclusion is reached: the irrelevancy of nationalism in today’s world. This source could allow the candidate to argue that the elements of race that had characterised earlier waves of “ethno-linguistic nationalisms” are seen as having a decreasing importance.

**Source B:** John Tosh argues race is a social construct shaped to reinforce “political and economic control over subordinate groups”. The candidate could note that “minorities with a strong ethnic identity” have used the concept of race to allow greater social cohesion within the confines of a nation. Tosh also argues that race brings not only biological descent as a descriptor but a shared culture as a “powerful amalgam,” suggesting that it is not just race that helps shape nationalism.

**Source C:** Linda Colley argues the importance of religion in the creation of a national identity, allowing the candidate to argue that the focus on race in Question One is too limiting, i.e. there are other factors that help shape this historical force of nationalism.

**Source D:** Richard J. Evans’s magisterial trilogy on the Third Reich focuses on the impact of colonial troops enforcing the authority of the British and French Governments following the defeat of Germany in World War One, and the occupation of the Rhineland and the Saar. However, it is the repetition of the idea in Source B that race is a construct that reflects a perceived superiority of Europeans over those inhabitants of countries colonised by Europeans that the candidate could also use.

**Source E1:** Paul Spoonley examines race and its influence on the political right in New Zealand. While the extract may be taken from a book about nationalism and race in this country, it allows the candidate to develop the general argument that race is an important, if not essential element in the shaping of nationalism. Elements of the extract could be used successfully to compare and contrast with ideas in the preceding sources.

**Source E2:** Daniel Trilling examines the role of race in establishing forms of nationalism, in particular populism, in his essay based on a review of two books. Eric Kaufmann’s book discusses immigration and race. This extract could allow the candidate to argue, as previous sources have, that the importance of race in the shaping of nationalism is a contested construct.

**Source F1:** Sassoon (Ed.) introduces a new idea: it is historians who shape this notion of nationalism for “history is the raw material for nationalist ... ideologies ...”. Sassoon, in this essay on Hobsbawm and nationalism, reminds us of Ernest Renan’s lecture in response to the question ‘What is a nation?’ and the importance of the past.

**Source F2:** Margaret MacMillan reinforces the emphasis on the importance of history in the shaping of the past further with the notion that it is the past and its collective memories that “provides much of the fuel for nationalism”. The candidate could also note an echo of **Sources A and E1** in this source with MacMillan’s claim that nationalism is a relatively recent development. Familiarity with this historian could enable the candidate to profitably refer to her argument about remembering and forgetting the past from other texts, where she discusses the notion of nationalism in an accessible and lucid fashion.

**Source G:** Ian Shapiro introduces another argument regarding the shaping of nationalism: xenophobia and the wilful exclusion of those who do not belong to the prevailing 'group'. Shapiro also suggests that ethnic affiliations are a powerful form of social cohesion, and so, the candidate could argue that there is a particular tension that arises from belonging or not belonging, which can shape this idea of nationalism.

**Source H:** Cannadine shows no focus on race – it appears to be of little consequence in the shaping of nationalism for him. He suggests that historians have played an important role in the shaping of ideas around the notion of nationalism. The candidate could argue that what is missing from this source – and others – is an examination of the significance of Social Darwinism in the shaping of nationalism and race, i.e. nationalism is clearly not as important a historical force as other sources might argue.

In the evaluation of these sources, the candidate could discuss the way in which different historians approach this question of nationalism and race. The usefulness of the sources can be evaluated in terms of the limitations of some, the contradictory nature of others. Reliability can be evaluated in terms of the ways in which these sources are supported – or not – by other sources. While it might be tempting for the candidate to note that Hobsbawm's views form particular arguments, and to evaluate his views through the lens of Marxism, this approach is limited and adds little to any argument, unless the candidate has a detailed understanding of a Marxist interpretation of the past. The candidate might find a critique of the lack of a range of perspectives in the sources more valuable, limiting their usefulness in allowing a full and comprehensive examination of the ideas in the question.

**Schedule 2: Criteria for Question Two**

<b>Outstanding Scholarship</b>	<p><b>7</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Constructs a clear and developed answer that addresses the question, written authoritatively and authentically.</li> <li>• Argues convincingly the importance of historical relationships in understanding key concepts.</li> <li>• Analyses a range of historical relationships, demonstrating an authentic understanding of their importance.</li> <li>• Evaluates a range of historical relationships in an informed manner.</li> </ul>	<p><b>8</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Constructs a clear and developed answer that addresses the question, written authoritatively and convincingly.</li> <li>• Argues perceptively the importance of historical relationships in understanding key concepts.</li> <li>• Analyses insightfully a range of historical relationships.</li> <li>• Evaluates a range of historical relationships in an informed and convincing manner.</li> </ul>
<b>Scholarship</b>	<p><b>5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responds to the question in a concise and clear manner.</li> <li>• Constructs an argument supported by source material, which is not consistently coherent.</li> <li>• Shows less understanding of the importance / complexity of historical relationships.</li> <li>• Does not use knowledge of historical relationships in other contexts effectively.</li> </ul>	<p><b>6</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responds with a clear and developed answer that addresses the question.</li> <li>• Shows an understanding of the importance / complexity of historical relationships and the way in which they enable a historian to understand how the significance of past events can change over time.</li> <li>• Constructs a clear and coherent argument explaining how the sources are interconnected and how there is a range of historical relationships.</li> <li>• Uses a range of sources to support the argument.</li> <li>• Demonstrates a knowledge of historical relationships in another historical context.</li> </ul>
<b>Below Scholarship</b>	<p><b>3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addresses the question but relies on a source-by-source analysis as a substitute for an argument.</li> <li>• Attempts to establish the importance of historical relationships.</li> <li>• Attempts to identify and integrate examples from the sources.</li> <li>• Identifies a historical relationship and other examples in one source but fails to successfully link any such historical relationship to the question.</li> <li>• Engages with the sources but without identifying how they allow an understanding of the importance of the historical event.</li> </ul>	<p><b>4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addresses the question clearly but not always consistently.</li> <li>• Establishes the importance of historical relationships.</li> <li>• Integrates examples from the sources into an argument.</li> <li>• Identifies historical relationships in one or two sources.</li> <li>• Engages with the sources without consistently demonstrating the relationship between the source material and the question.</li> <li>• Identifies and incorporates examples from the sources in an argument and attempts to explain their importance.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a very limited and brief response.</li> <li>• Shows little evidence of any understanding of the scope of the question.</li> <li>• Attempts to identify a historical relationship but does not demonstrate any understanding of how it relates to the event.</li> </ul>	<p><b>2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempts a response but fails to address the question.</li> <li>• Makes simple points without evidence from the sources.</li> <li>• Identifies a historical relationship with a limited understanding of its importance or identifies more than one historical relationship but fails to explain its purpose.</li> <li>• Identifies historical relationships implicitly.</li> </ul>

## Examples of possible approaches to Question Two

**To what extent do the historical relationships in Sources I–N, and in particular cause and effect, enable historians to understand the tensions between race and nationalism in the Dreyfus Affair?**

### Evidence

The focus of the source material and the question is an event that was to divide France, an event that brings together the two elements that are the focus of the 2022 examination: nationalism and race. The accusation of a French Jew, Alfred Dreyfus, of treason resulted in a significant miscarriage of justice, perpetrated by establishment forces. Anti-Semitism and nationalism were potent forces, dividing France culturally and politically. The causes and effects of this event are of particular significance, and it is this relationship that the candidate has been asked to address, as well as the possible identification and analysis of other historical relationships.

The candidate could construct their answer by:

- acknowledging the complexities of the different political and cultural causes and effects in the sources
- identifying the ways in which this event has long-term causes and effects
- showing how a specific event like the Dreyfus Affair can reflect the generalities that emerge in any examination of nationalism and race
- identifying that a focus on race limits an understanding of this event
- acknowledging the importance of this event in understanding a later period of French history
- showing understanding of other historical relationships that are evident in the source material
- arguing the importance of certain historical relationships to understand this event
- demonstrating how this event acts as a prism for issues of nationalism and race.

Ideas from the sources could include:

**Source I1:** Ruth Harris suggests that it is not race that emerges in this narrative but political factors, and so enables the candidate to comment on other elements at play in this event, such as identifying the relationship between past and present, and to comment on the lasting significance of this event and its “unique place in the French political psyche”. A further analysis of this source could lead to a comment on how events in the past can be reshaped to suit a particular narrative.

**Source I2:** The image of a statue of Dreyfus in a prominent part of Paris suggests the significance of this event. In the description of events leading up to the erection of the statue, the candidate could comment on the way in which the military establishment continued to be mindful of the way in which the Dreyfus Affair had impacted on the army – its willingness to humiliate Dreyfus is reflected in the image of the broken sword and the subsequent humiliation of its bearer.

**Source J:** Jeremy D. Popkin argues the importance of anti-Semitism in informing an understanding of the Dreyfus Affair. The candidate could use this source to not only develop an argument regarding the significance of prejudice as a cause, but to examine economic and political forces, particularly Popkin’s argument that ideas of tolerance and equality were seen as responsible for “leading the country to disaster”. A clear effect of the affair is noted with the reference to Zionism and its emergence as a political force.

**Source K:** Barbara Tuchman discusses the different causes and effects that are part of this event. There are a range of causes that are evident in this source and the candidate could take the opportunity to distinguish the different causes, by identifying them as political, cultural, etc, and so support an argument responding to the demands of the question: the tension between nationalism and race.

**Source L:** Cecil Jenkins expands on the notion that the Dreyfus Affair has underlying causes, that evaluating this event in terms of race and nationalism ignores the historical forces that have been part of French post-revolutionary history. The complications of cultural and political elements, and the relationship between cause and effect could be noted as meeting the descriptor ‘important’ in the question.

**Sources M1 and M2:** Piers Paul Read and Paula E. Hyman examine the way in which the role of race – of anti-Semitism – has been questioned since the Dreyfus Affair. Both sources could allow the candidate to comment on the long-term effects of the Affair, the deportation of Jews in World War Two, the continuing debate as to the cause(s) of the Affair, the role of the Catholic Church, and “the contest between two very different visions of France and its national identity”. The candidate could also discuss how – as suggested in **Source M2** – the Dreyfus Affair reflects the relationship between specific and general.

**Source N:** Douglas Johnson lists a range of possible causes, some of which will be familiar to the candidate from previous sources. There are a significant number of differing causes – and implied with each cause is the ‘effect’ – the incarceration of an innocent man. The variety of causes could allow the candidate to successfully argue that to gain a critical understanding of the Dreyfus Affair, it is necessary to examine the tensions between nationalism and race.

Question Two specifically acknowledges the possible importance of causal relationships in establishing an understanding of the Dreyfus Affair. The Scholarship candidate should be able to move beyond examining the temporal nature of cause and effect. While analysing the short-term and long-term cause(s) and effect(s) that exist, the candidate could discuss various elements, such as the political, economic, cultural, and religious characteristics of some of these causal relationships. It is important for the candidate to do more than simply identify and describe historical relationships, i.e. the way in which they add to our understanding of a historical event should be discussed.

**Schedule 3: Criteria for Question Three**

<b>Outstanding Scholarship</b>	<b>7</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addresses the question by acknowledging its complexities in a clear and concise manner.</li> <li>Constructs a persuasive and perceptive argument.</li> <li>Constructs an argument that engages with the historical context in a confident manner.</li> <li>Connects the source material to the historical context and key ideas in an informed manner.</li> <li>Demonstrates a high level of critical thinking.</li> <li>Arrives at an insightful conclusion.</li> </ul>	<b>8</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addresses the question by acknowledging its complexities in a convincing manner.</li> <li>Constructs an argument that is assured and perceptive.</li> <li>Constructs an argument that engages with the historical context in an authoritative and confident manner.</li> <li>Connects the source material to the historical context and key ideas in an informed and authoritative manner.</li> <li>Demonstrates a high level of critical thinking.</li> <li>Arrives at an insightful and pervasive conclusion.</li> </ul>
<b>Scholarship</b>	<b>5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addresses the question in a clear and concise manner.</li> <li>Constructs an argument that demonstrates an understanding of the historical context.</li> <li>Constructs an argument that shows an ability to evaluate and analyse the key ideas in the topic.</li> <li>Integrates the source material in a convincing manner.</li> </ul>	<b>6</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addresses the question in a clear and concise manner.</li> <li>Constructs an argument that demonstrates an informed understanding and knowledge of the historical context.</li> <li>Constructs an argument that shows an ability to thoughtfully evaluate and analyse the key ideas in the topic.</li> <li>Integrates the source material in a coherent and convincing manner.</li> </ul>
<b>Below Scholarship</b>	<b>3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attempts to respond to the question but does not show a broad understanding and knowledge of the context.</li> <li>Attempts to construct an argument but this is limited in its effectiveness.</li> <li>Uses several sources to support an argument but is unable to develop a connection to the historical context and / or key ideas.</li> </ul>	<b>4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addresses the question and attempts to respond to its scope and intent.</li> <li>Constructs an argument that relies on the source material, limiting its effectiveness.</li> <li>Integrates the source material successfully but with limited reference to the relationship between the sources and the question.</li> <li>Provides a well-written response but does not demonstrate a sound knowledge of the historical context and / or key ideas.</li> </ul>
	<b>1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Constructs a very limited and brief response.</li> <li>Demonstrates little evidence of any understanding of the scope of the question.</li> <li>Demonstrates little evidence of any understanding of the historical context.</li> </ul>	<b>2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attempts to address the question but without providing evidence to suggest any knowledge / understanding of the context.</li> <li>Does not demonstrate an ability to write at length.</li> <li>Attempts to respond to the source material.</li> </ul>

**Examples of possible approaches to Question Three**

**Using Sources O–Q, to what extent did race play an important role in the shaping of our nation in 1920?**

Evidence

The candidate will recognise that, as with previous questions, this question invites an argument which examines and evaluates a particular statement: here, it is the importance of race in 1920 within the context of nationalism.

The candidate could construct their answer by:

- recognising race was not seen as having any importance in shaping how we saw ourselves in 1920
- questioning the use of the possessive 'our', i.e. whose perspective is being addressed
- acknowledging race was important in shaping an emerging nationalism
- recognising ties to the imperial heartland meant race was viewed in traditional and monocultural terms
- arguing that following World War One, and our engagement in significant battles, we were ready to reject the national certainties of the past
- acknowledging Māori may have been encouraged to take up arms and support the country in war, but were unable to enjoy the same support and recognition as Pākehā
- recognising race is but one factor in the shaping of a nation – there are also other forces that determine a sense of nationhood.

Ideas from the sources could include:

**Source O1:** The image, while dating from 1916, reinforces the understanding that in remembering Gallipoli and ANZAC forces, we continue to preserve this notion of race and nationhood as being quintessentially defined by our association with Britain.

**Source O2:** Maureen Sharpe shows the steps taken to create a public holiday to commemorate New Zealand's involvement in World War One. This source could enable the candidate to argue how this commemoration has shaped our sense of nationhood but also give the opportunity to argue that a connection with Britain and Empire continued unchallenged.

**Source P1:** The poster for Māori conscription is often used to illustrate how Māori were encouraged to enlist and fight. The fighting depicted in this poster is at Gallipoli, and the candidate could note how this element of race is introduced: that this was a war fought by Māori proudly fierce of their own traditions, traditions distinct from those of 'Mother England'.

**Source P2:** The Ministry for Culture and Heritage summarises the measures taken to support soldiers returning from the war. There is little to note in this source other than to perhaps remark how a grateful nation was prepared to recognise the sacrifices made by those who had taken up arms to serve the interests of their nation.

**Source P3:** Monty Soutar demonstrates that this notion of nationalism and race coming together, united in combat, was fallacious. The discrimination that Māori had faced in an earlier time continued after the war, as any sacrifices Māori might have made in enlisting and fighting were ignored: Anglo-Saxon supremacy would continue undiluted.

**Source P4:** Phillipa Mein Stein reinforces the ways in which Māori were actively disadvantaged and explains the importance of Rātana and his attempts to address Māori poverty.

**Source P5:** Avril Bell (in an extract from a school textbook) encourages children to believe that there are two races that would stand united against challenges to our nationhood, that the disputes of the past could be cheerfully ignored, as we faced a future together as one.

**(Sources P1–P5 also examine the relationship between Māori and Pākehā.)**

**Source P6:** The image of a memorial to conflict in the nineteenth century suggests that in 1920, nationalism and race were shaped by a particular narrative in which a war was fought to determine control of a 'nation', a 'nation' in which the triumphant colonial forces enabled a society to emerge untroubled by the past.

**Source Q:** The image is a reminder of the strong and important links to Britain that were reflected in the institution of the monarchy. The pending arrival of the Prince of Wales suggests a certain and generous welcome for his role as representing the British Crown and his future position as King of this country. The candidate may note how the poster uses te reo as part of its welcoming message and comment accordingly.

*Note: The context for this question is signalled to the candidate at the start of the academic year and so there is an expectation that there will be a familiarity with some of the ideas in these sources. There are other ideas and events which the candidate could profitably discuss within the context of the question: New Zealand's attendance at the Treaty of Versailles, the placing of Samoa under New Zealand control, the first national team sent to the Olympics; these events allow the candidate to discuss nationalism and race in these contexts.*

## Cut Scores

Scholarship	Outstanding Scholarship
13 – 18	19 – 24