

## Assessment Schedule – 2023

### Scholarship History (93403)

The 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>	<b>7</b> <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>	<b>8</b> <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>	<b>5</b> <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>	<b>6</b> <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>	<b>3</b> <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>	<b>4</b> <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>
	<b>1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not address the question.</li> <li>Shows little understanding of historical narratives.</li> </ul>	<b>2</b> <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–J enable historians to understand the importance of communism as a historical force?**

### Evidence

The candidate could respond to “importance” in several different ways. Some ways in which importance can be assessed are by:

- the length of time communism has been an element in the shaping of political / economic / social structures
- the number of people who have been impacted by communism
- the societal change wrought by communism through revolutions
- its shaping of historical narratives
- its importance in the shaping of a dialectical analysis of the past.

The candidate could also argue that the importance of communism has diminished and that its relevance can be questioned. There is also an argument that, regardless of its perceived failure to help construct a successful economic / societal structure, communism remains an important method of determining possible interpretations of the past, present, and future.

There is a wealth of source material that focuses on the development of communism and the various historical narratives that argue for its relevance, and the candidate should be able to bring to their argument both a knowledge and understanding of historical events – the Russian and Chinese Revolutions, the Cold War – as well as historians such as Niall Ferguson and Francis Fukuyama, whose perspectives on communism are well worth considering, but have not been included in the source material. The candidate could use the absence of these historians to question the validity of the source material, arguing that to enable the importance of communism, a wider and more varied range of source material is needed.

Ideas from the sources could include:

**Source A:** Richard Cohen establishes the importance of communism as a historical force whose influence has helped shape perspectives of societal structures. Cohen also argues that the concept of communism has emerged in different societies at different times. The references to Greek, Persian, English (Sir Thomas More), and French perspectives further establishes its importance in time and place.

**Source B:** Rawiri Taonui suggests the communalism and collectivism that characterised Māori society was an impediment to Europeans’ ability to gain control of land. The source gives a specific example of how the idea of ‘communism’ underpinned life in pre-European Aotearoa, and how contrary it was to European notions of societal structures. The candidate could successfully use their knowledge of nineteenth-century Aotearoa New Zealand to discuss the Native Land Courts and their intent and effect.

**Source C:** Andreas Sofroniou places the idea of communism in particular historical settings, clearly making a case for the importance of communism, and the candidate could argue that its usefulness as a source is compromised by the unquestioning approach to this historical force. The candidate could question the absence of any substantial analysis of Marx’s actual works and argue that extracts from key passages would have been helpful.

**Source D:** Margaret MacMillan argues that communism, as shaped by Marx, is important because it offers a significant analysis of a linear approach to history. An understanding of Hegel and his influence would also be of use to the candidate. Importance can perhaps also be measured by a dialectical examination of European and Chinese ways of analysing the past.

**Source E:** John Tosh alludes to the importance of Marxist theory and how claims of irrelevancy in a changing world can be refuted by Tosh’s suggestion that a recognition of the continuing benefits of a “... theoretical approach that is rooted in the material realities of human life ... will once more be recognised”.

**Source F:** Eric Hobsbawm questions Marx’s analysis of communism as an inevitable historical development, and this will doubtless be welcomed by the candidate familiar with Hobsbawm’s stature as a Marxist historian. This could encourage the candidate to arrive at conclusions, which might question the infallibility of communism as a historical force.

**Source G:** Sheila Fitzpatrick, an Australian historian who is an acknowledged expert on the Russian Revolution and recent Soviet history, argues about the diminishing importance of communism as a vehicle for political and economic change. This could enable the candidate to easily support any argument about the growing irrelevancy of communism.

**Source H:** Richard J. Evans examines the relevancy of communism. His argument that the complexity of recent events – environmental, societal, and economic – diminishes the underlying assumptions of Marxist communism and its possible importance.

**Source I:** Ian Shapiro explains communism's weaknesses – how almost every prediction Marx made as to the development of communism was wrong; and he argues also that its importance continues to lie in the intellectual rigour that underpins Marxism.

**Source J:** Felipe Fernández-Armesto continues this argument: that it continues to offer “... a solution to the problems of managing societies”, reinforcing the idea that communism as a historical force continues to have a role to play in the shaping of events in the present and the future. The candidate might remark on Fernández-Armesto's suggestion that believing in communism is akin to a religious belief – an idea suggested in earlier sources. The candidate might question the disconnection between this idea of a quasi-religious notion and earlier arguments supporting the argument that Marxism offers a reasoned and scientific explanation for historical change.

**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 K–S enable historians to understand the complexities of McCarthyism in post-World War II America?**

### Evidence

The causes of McCarthyism are complex and, as always, an ability to qualify them – cultural, political, social, and short term / long term – should be used when acknowledging the question.

The candidate could respond to “complexities” in several different ways. Some ways in which complexities can be measured are by:

- the differing causes and effects of McCarthyism
- the different ways in which the characteristics of McCarthyism continue to have an impact
- the ways in which the range of historical relationships reflect complexity
- the differing perspectives of politicians and the various groups targeted and impacted
- the ways in which McCarthyism is part of established patterns / trends evident in American political life.

Ideas from the sources could include:

**Source K:** Brian MacArthur (Ed.) offers an extract from the speech that McCarthy made in which he describes a country beset by the forces of communism in an “all-out battle” against the Christian traditions of the United States. He also identifies another group he claims is working against the interests of ordinary Americans: “those who have had all the benefits that the wealthiest nation on earth has to offer”. It is the identification of atheism v Christianity and privileged members of government, as well as the forces of communism, that the candidate can use to respond to the idea of complexities.

**Source L1:** The image of the threat of communism suggests a fiery and dangerous future if communism is allowed to gain control. The implied effects may be exaggerated, but this is a very accessible source, and the candidate can argue that the perception of death and destruction is important in allowing McCarthyism to gain a ready audience.

**Source L2:** The image of anti-communist literature shows how McCarthyism and a fear of communism is also about a battle for the cultural underpinnings of America. The candidate can use this poster to argue that the complexities of the question are very much in evidence: it is not just the perceived elite who are working to undermine American interests, but the creative forces of film and television. The candidate could argue that the focus on television portrays the insidious effects of communism will be experienced by children – the enemy has entered American homes.

**Source M:** Erzsébet Árvay enables the candidate to show that the effects of McCarthyism and attacks on Hollywood resulted in the exile of Chaplin and the interrogation of Lucille Ball – two entertainment stars of the period. The candidate could also use this source to argue the relationship between the general and specific, and so strengthen an argument for the complexities of this historical force.

**Source N:** Ellen Schrecker argues about the long-term effects of McCarthyism and that these effects played out in international affairs, increasing the possible complexities of this movement. The resulting insignificance of the communist party at home and the fear of Chinese influence reflected in American engagement in Vietnam.

**Sources O:** Sam Tanenhaus suggests that the different ways in which the Republican Party used “McCarthy’s themes, betrayal and disloyalty” for their own purposes adds to an understanding of the complexities of McCarthyism. The candidate could recognise the reference to “conspiracy theories” and suggest that while the focus for American fears had changed, the willingness to believe in forces working to undermine the interests of Americans had not.

**Source P:** Jill Lepore examines other possible causes for the crusade against communism. This source further increases the ability of the candidate to respond to the question and argue the complexities of this historical force of McCarthyism.

**Source Q:** Larry Tye argues that McCarthy was part of a long-established tradition of demagoguery in America. The candidate should find this source useful in arguing for continuity / change, general / specific, patterns / trends, as well as continuing to identify and explain the causes and effects of this brand of demagoguery.

**Source R:** Jon Meacham offers opportunism as another possible cause, explaining the appearance of Roy Cohn as a key player in this period of McCarthyism. Past / present and change / continuity also make an appearance, as well as a possible reference to the 45<sup>th</sup> President of the United States.

**Source S:** James T. Patterson continues earlier references to demagoguery, and to possible causes and effects, some of which were mentioned in earlier sources. The differing reasons for McCarthyism are certainly complex, and the candidate can argue that while communism is an important element, it is certainly not the only one.

**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 persuasive 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 T–X, to what extent did a fear of communism shape domestic and foreign policy in Aotearoa New Zealand in the years 1950 to 1954?

#### Evidence

The candidate could respond to “a fear of communism” in several different ways. Some ways in which a fear of communism influenced our domestic and foreign policies could be measured by:

- the attempts by the Government to end the Watersiders’ strike
- the draconian methods used to defeat a union regarded as a danger to the national interest
- the way in which a fear of communist influence was used by the Government to serve their own interests
- a fear of communism being more imagined than real
- other issues of importance being neglected
- the moral values of the country perceived as being under threat because of the emergence of “bodgies”
- the issues being real and significant for Māori but being ignored by a conservative government
- our ties to Britain continuing to be of significance and also our trade
- the alliances we entered with countries such as the USA as a response to the perceived threat of communism in Asia
- one of the most important alliances – ANZUS – was formed more from a fear of a resurgent Japan than from the forces of communism.

A superficial approach to this essay question could construct an argument outlining the way that communist leadership was responsible for the Watersiders’ strike, thus putting at risk our exports – a risk the government could not afford to take. Our fear of communism spreading across the Pacific and threatening interests beyond our shores was responsible for support for Britain in Malaya, the UN in Korea, SEATO, and the ANZUS alliance. A more complex argument would note that the government’s response to the Watersiders’ strike was more about its interests; that communism challenged the orthodoxies of the period but never threatened the political and economic structures; and that there were other issues that were either neglected or preoccupied the nation. Our international search for security was less about a fear of communism than a desire to find safety after World War II had removed the previous certainties.

Ideas from the sources could include:

**Source T1:** Redmer Yska sets out a particular interpretation of the Watersiders’ strike. It gives some background information and suggests that a fear of communism was a perception used to advantage by the government of the day. It signals to candidates that there were other issues at play in this dispute.

**Source T2:** Melanie Nolan supports Yska’s argument, and the candidate could find in this brief extract a few reasons that enable a more complex argument to be constructed about the role of communism in domestic politics.

**Source U1:** The image of a National Party poster covers the government’s explanation for its stand against communism, its influence in the union movement, and its call for votes in the upcoming election. All the various elements of the poster suggest that a fear of communism was a significant element in the political discourse – at least for those likely to vote National.

**Source U2:** The image of “The Saga of Shifty Sid” presents a communist perspective. The candidate could use this source to identify some of the issues that preoccupied the political left: acknowledgement of fears of renewed Japanese militarism, the alignment with American economic and political interests, the attempts to diminish the efficacy of trade unions, and the negative impact on pensioners and Māori.

**Source V1:** Richard S. Hill describes the government disengagement from the concerns of Māori and, importantly, explains the attempts by the government to gain access to land at Ōrākei, foreshadowing the 1977 Bastion Point occupation.

**Source V2:** The image of the newly formed Māori Women’s Welfare League at their first conference suggests that Māori were actively involved in attempting to remedy some of the issues and problems confronting Māori – issues that were neglected by the government.

**Source W:** The image of “bodgies” suggests that there were other issues that were of concern: the emergence of a youth culture – which posed a threat to the values of an older generation – and possibly a greater threat than that posed by communism, as it resulted in the establishment of a special inquiry into this perceived threat to the status quo. Moral turpitude in a domestic setting was more frightening than a perceived threat from foreign lands.

**Source X1:** Michael Green describes how a fear of communism spurred Aotearoa New Zealand to join SEATO, support Britain in Malaya, and to support the US in Vietnam.

**Source X2:** The image of the signing of the ANZUS treaty in San Francisco is a visual confirmation of the text in Source X1. The candidate could note that it was in that city that New Zealand took an important role in establishing support for the emerging United Nations.

**Source X3:** The image is another visual confirmation of the role New Zealand was to play in supporting the United Nations and the US in the fight against the encroaching forces of communist North Korea.

*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. The candidate will note that the source material dealing with our international alliances and excursions are few and brief. This is because there is an expectation that this element of the question will be familiar to many candidates following three years of senior History, in which topics such as the Cold War, ANZUS, and Vietnam are likely to have been studied.*

### Cut Scores

Scholarship	Outstanding Scholarship
13 – 18	19 – 24