

Assessment Schedule – 2019**History: Analyse evidence relating to an historical event of significance to New Zealanders (91436)****Assessment Criteria**

Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
<i>Analyse</i> involves using historians' skills to interpret evidence in order to demonstrate understanding of historical concepts.	<i>Analyse, in depth</i> , involves using historians' skills to interpret evidence in order to demonstrate thorough understanding of historical concepts.	<i>Comprehensively analyse</i> involves using historians' skills to interpret evidence in order to demonstrate understanding of historical concepts, showing insight.

Cut Scores

Not Achieved	Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
0 – 8	9 – 12	13 – 18	19 – 24

Evidence**Question One: Perspectives**

The candidate analyses and explains ways in which David Low has been viewed by different individuals or groups over time, using the Introduction and Sources A–E.

A3	A4	M5	M6	E7	E8
Assesses the evidence and identifies and explains the different ways in which David Low has been viewed by different groups or individuals over time (explanation may be limited and / or lack depth of evidence from specific sources).	Assesses the evidence and identifies and explains the different ways in which David Low has been viewed by different groups or individuals over time.	Assesses the evidence and identifies and analyses the different ways in which David Low has been viewed by different groups or individuals over time.	Assesses the evidence and identifies and analyses, in depth, the different ways in which David Low has been viewed by different groups or individuals over time.	Assesses the evidence and identifies and analyses, with some insight, the different ways in which David Low has been viewed by different groups or individuals over time.	Assesses the evidence and identifies and analyses, with insight, the different ways in which David Low has been viewed by different groups or individuals over time.
Includes reference to some of the sources (Sources A–E) and attempts to explain the perspectives by placing them in the correct context (may be limited).	Includes reference to some of the sources (Sources A–E) and attempts to explain the perspectives by placing them in the correct context.	Includes specific reference to some of the sources (the Introduction, Sources A–E) and explains the perspectives by accurately placing them in context.	Includes specific reference to most of the sources (the Introduction and Sources A–E) and fully explains the perspectives by accurately placing them in context (may attempt to categorise, group, or otherwise define the perspectives in ways other than “negative” and “positive”).	Includes some comprehensive reference to some of the sources (Introduction and Sources A–E) by selecting the most relevant information and examples to support perceptive generalisations.	Includes comprehensive reference to most of the sources (Introduction and Sources A–E) by discerningly selecting the most relevant information and examples to support perceptive generalisations.
				Comments on the limitations / bias / validity of the perspective.	Comments on the limitations / bias / validity of the perspective.

N0 = No response; no relevant evidence.

N1 = Some relevant evidence, but extremely limited.

N2 = Relevant evidence but may not have interpreted the sources correctly; or may not have the perspectives correct; or shows insufficient depth of analysis for Level 3.

Sample Evidence

Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
<p><i>Assessment of the evidence, identification and explanation</i> could include, but is not limited to:</p> <p>Positive perspectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low earned world fame (Introduction). • Letter writers bestowed praise on him (Source A). • “Magnificent work”, “well-deserved fame”, “best cartoonist in the world” (Source D). • “Great artist whose creative work I regard with admiration” (Source D), “admires your glorious art” (Source C). • “He was a colossus of world cartooning” (Source E). <p>Negative perspectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hated by Hitler and Mussolini (Introduction); was on Gestapo arrest list, “Low was number two after Churchill on Hitler’s post-war death list” (Source E). • His cartoons being banned in Germany and Italy (Introduction). • Readers thought he should be sacked after his negative depiction of Churchill, and Vice-Admiral T. N. James said, “has not the time arrived when he should be packed off to New Zealand?” (Source A). • Though many of these letters show high displeasure (Source A). • “Low makes me sick in his effort to come back; he made a mistake against good taste and is not man enough to admit it” (Source A). • “Warmonger” (Sources B & E). • Mrs Asquith saw his cartoons as “both cruel and mischievous” (Source B). 	<p><i>Assessment of the evidence, identification and in-depth analysis</i> could include, but is not limited to:</p> <p>Positive perspectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must have been hugely respected to receive honorary degrees from the universities of New Brunswick (1938) and Leicester (1961) (Introduction). • Offered a knighthood twice, accepted in 1962 (Introduction). • Despite the fact he slighted the PM and upset many people, others could still see his skill and genius: “Letters slighting Low’s cartoons prove the shallowness of some people in not realising the genius of the greatest cartoonist of our time” (Source A). • Source B shows international / foreign support for Low, corroborated in Source D by Soviet artists, “Russian cartoonists regarded him as the best cartoonist in the world and, according to Churchill, Stalin had a Low on the wall in his office”. • Someone artists could learn from (Source D). • “His autobiography is still a great foundation for anyone thinking of being a political cartoonist in spite of all the changes brought by technology” (Source E). • Among the greats of cartoonists: “Not since the days of James Gilray and Thomas Nast had a cartoonist had as much political pull as David Low” (Source E). • Highly skilled: Arnold Bennett praised him, “If the Press Lords of this country had any genuine imagination they would immediately begin to compete for the service of the cartoonist and get him to London on the next steamer” (Source E). <p>Negative perspectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David Low was seen as stubborn and tasteless: “Low makes me sick in his effort to come back; he made a mistake against good taste and is not man enough to admit it” (Source A). • Prime Minister Billy Hughes disliked him (Source E) to the extent he wanted him censored and conscripted. • The Conservative Party disliked him as they felt he too often attacked them / Neville Chamberlain (Source B). 	<p><i>Assessment of the evidence, identification and insightful analysis</i> could include, but is not limited to:</p> <p>Perspectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative critique against Low naturally comes from those targeted in his cartoons such as the Conservative Party, the Nazi regime, and Chamberlain. • There is strong bias in the positive such as the comment from Freud, as a Jewish refugee, he is likely to be in support of anyone who takes on Hitler and oppose a soft touch / appeasement toward the Nazi regime. • Different time periods in which these comments for / against appeared, and how the context of war would shape / influence the response of those who commented on Low’s work. • Low’s comments on both Chamberlain and Churchill (both PMs at their respective time) could be linked and seen as unpatriotic in the climate of war, or warmongering during appeasement phase. • Being given a job, even by someone like Lord Beaverbrook, who he often targeted in an unflattering way shows the talent Low must have had (Source E).

Evidence

Question Two: General and Specific

The candidate explains how the Sources G–I provide specific examples of the generalisations made about political cartoons by the author and publisher Dr Thomas Milton Kemnitz in Source F.

A3	A4	M5	M6	E7	E8
Interprets the evidence by identifying the general argument provided by Kemnitz and describing how it specifically applied to the cartoons and extract provided.	Interprets the evidence by identifying the general argument provided by Kemnitz and describing how it specifically applied to the cartoons and extract provided.	Assesses the evidence and explains the general argument provided by Kemnitz and how it specifically applied to the cartoons and extract provided.	Assesses the evidence and explains, in depth, the general argument provided by Kemnitz and how it specifically applied to the cartoons and extract provided.	Assesses the evidence by analysing, with some insight, the general argument provided by Kemnitz and how it specifically applied to the cartoons and extract provided.	Assesses the evidence by analysing, with insight, the general argument provided by Kemnitz and how it specifically applied to the cartoons and extract provided.
Includes reference to some of the sources (Sources F–I) and attempts to explain the historical concept of general and specific (may be limited).	Includes reference to some of the sources (Sources F–I) and attempts to explain the historical concept of general and specific.	Includes specific reference to some of the sources (Sources F–I) and explains the historical concept of general and specific, with at least two examples of the “general-specific” relationship.	Includes specific reference to most of the sources (Sources F–I) and explains the historical concept of general and specific.	Includes some comprehensive reference to some of the sources (Sources F–I) by selecting the most relevant information and examples to support perceptive generalisations about the historical concept of general and specific.	Includes comprehensive reference to most of the sources (Sources F–I) by discerningly selecting the most relevant information and examples to support perceptive generalisations about the historical concept of general and specific.
<p>N0 = No response; no relevant evidence.</p> <p>N1 = Some relevant evidence, but extremely limited.</p> <p>N2 = Relevant evidence but may not have interpreted sources correctly; or may not have the general and specific historical concept correct; or shows insufficient depth of analysis for Level 3.</p>					

Sample Evidence

Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
<p><i>Assessment of the evidence and explanation could include, but is not limited to:</i></p> <p><u>General idea (Source F)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historians must consider the purpose for which cartoons were published. • The intention of the cartoonist and publisher affect both how representative the cartoons were and what impact they had. <p><i>(Achievement responses may address less complex ideas.)</i></p> <p><u>Specific examples from Sources G–I to support general idea of Source F</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source F: Intention of this cartoon is to show that Churchill was supported and people (student may not identify them as politicians) were prepared to get behind him and support him. • Source G: A political cartoon and is called “The Argument” so may link to Source E’s idea that cartoons can emphasise different / political tensions. 	<p><i>Evaluation of the evidence and in-depth explanation could include, but is not limited to:</i></p> <p><u>General idea (Source F)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many cartoonists have been employed by politicians or by organs of political parties to put across partisan opinions. • Foreign affairs may be designed to unify or bolster a nation. • Emphasise differences and increase the political temperature. <p><i>(Merit responses may address more complex ideas.)</i></p> <p><u>Specific examples from Sources G–I to support general idea of Source F</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source F: Not only “unity” but the idea of bipartisan party support, which would in turn have the possible effect of uniting / bolstering the nation for the war effort. • Source G: Two-headed ass is clearly not a flattering depiction of the effectiveness of the government / coalition under David Lloyd George, and therefore is likely to increase political temperatures at the time. 	<p><i>Discerning evaluation of the evidence and explanation could include, but is not limited to:</i></p> <p><u>Specific examples from Sources G–I to support general idea of Source F</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source F is not unusual as wartime propaganda, but this in itself supports the general argument made by Kemnitz that the purpose and intention of the cartoon / cartoonist is important for historians to consider. • Source F was produced in 1940, during which time the German position was strong, so to appear united and powerful and “all behind” the leader and his approach to the war effort was important. • Many cartoonists have been employed by politicians or by organs of political parties to put across partisan opinions. A specific example of this is in Source I, which notes “instead of expressing a Left outlook in a Right Wing newspaper, he should place his talents at the disposal of Labour’s own paper”. This suggests the biased nature of these newspapers. • On the other hand, contrary to the contention that some cartoonists are used as a mouth organ for political parties, several sources talk of Low’s freedom of expression, even to go against the papers’ stance (Introduction, Sources D, I, and / or J). • Source I is a little contradictory in saying Low’s talents are “at the disposal of Labour’s own paper” but then says “Low will enjoy the freedom on which he has always insisted. His political independence will be complete. Whenever he thinks fit, he will poke fun at Labour personalities and criticise official policy”. • Without having the wider context of how people responded to these cartoons, it is difficult to know whether the bias / intention of the cartoon was in fact realised by the general population or not.

Evidence

Question Three: Usefulness, Limitations and Significance

The candidate analyses the extent to which **Sources J and K** would be **useful** to a historian studying the **significance** of David Low and his work during the 1930s and 1940s.

A3	A4	M5	M6	E7	E8
Examines Sources J and / or K and explains the ways in which they would be useful for a historian studying the significance of David Low and his work during the 1930s and 1940s.	Examines Sources J and / or K and explains the ways in which it is useful for a historian studying the significance of David Low and his work during the 1930s and 1940s.	Evaluates Sources J and / or K and explains the extent to which it is useful for a historian studying the significance of David Low and his work during the 1930s and 1940s.	Evaluates Sources J and / or K, and explains, in depth, the extent to which it is useful for a historian studying the significance of David Low and his work during the 1930s and 1940s.	Evaluates Sources J and / or K, and analyses, the extent to which it is useful for a historian studying the significance of David Low and his work during the 1930s and 1940s.	Evaluates Sources J and / or K, and insightfully analyses, the extent to which it is useful for a historian studying the significance of David Low and his work during the 1930s and 1940s.
	Refers to Sources J and / or K and attempts to explain how they are limited in their usefulness.	Refers specifically to Sources J and / or K and explains how they are limited in their usefulness.	Refers specifically to Sources J and / or K and explains, in depth, how Sources J and / or K are limited in their usefulness.	Refers specifically to Sources J and / or K and analyses how they are limited in their usefulness.	Refers specifically to Sources J and / or K and insightfully analyses how they are limited in their usefulness.
				Uses the other sources to corroborate with Sources J and K, demonstrating insight and engagement with the sources.	Uses the other sources convincingly to corroborate with Sources J and K, demonstrating insight and engagement with the sources.

N0 = No response; no relevant evidence.

N1 = Some relevant evidence, but extremely limited.

N2 = Relevant evidence but may not have interpreted the sources correctly or may not have made valid comments on their usefulness; may have ignored the specifics of the question such as “the significance of David Low”; or shows insufficient depth of analysis for Level 3.

Sample Evidence

Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
<p><i>Examination and explanation</i> could include, but is not limited to:</p> <p>Usefulness in showing the significance of David Low</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donnelly states "With the exception of Lord Rutherford, he is probably the greatest man this country has produced" so therefore is significant (Source J). • In his chosen arts of caricaturing and cartooning, David Low has no superiors to-day (Source J). • "I discovered in London that Low is something of a legendary figure" (Source J). • Source J is useful as written in 1935 (when Low was most current) and it appears the author has been to London and spoken to Londoners first-hand about Low (primary source). • Lawlor sees him as "our world famous cartoonist", also writing from the time in which Low's work was popular, i.e. 1941 (primary source). • "David Low has proved that although he is one of the biggest names in the world to-day, although he is immortalised in Madam Tussauds, although his war cartoons have been 'Penguin-ised' in millions throughout the world, he is sufficiently great" (Source K). 	<p><i>Evaluation and in-depth explanation</i> could include, but is not limited to:</p> <p>Usefulness in showing the significance of David Low</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Useful in revealing the limited significance of Low to New Zealanders, as despite his success by 1935 "To the majority of New Zealanders, David Low is scarcely even a name" (Source J). • Highly significant: "With exception of Rutherford, he is probably the greatest man this country has produced", but only if criteria for greatness "is being judged by the fame the men have acquired since they left home to try their fortunes in a larger world" (Source J). • Considered a "vital force in British politics" (Source J). • David Low must be significant to be in the employment of Lord Beaverbrook (Source J). • Significant as his "portrayal" of key people is often how the public then come to imagine them: "The impression of any political leader which he commits to paper is often liable to become the impression that thousands of people imagine" (Source J). • Significant overseas in London, "he is generally and tirelessly discussed" (Source J). • Appears that a bit of a "contest" over whether Low was a New Zealander or an Australian has broken out; "disprove the reiterated claim made in overseas journals that Low is an Australian" which may suggest he is someone that a nation wants to "claim" (Source K). • Sources J and K have a similar message / stance on Low and thus could act as corroboration for each other. <p><i>(Merit responses may typically frame Low's significance in a particular context.)</i></p> <p>Limitations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both sources written by New Zealanders, therefore could be bias. • Overly emotive praise in Source K may make a historian cautious of using this source without corroboration. • Both sources written by New Zealanders, therefore have not got an international perspective. • Both written within the height of Low's work but would be good to know if the opinion / legacy of Low is as strong or of the same import to people today (thus showing lasting significance). 	<p><i>Evaluation and insightful analysis</i> could include, but is not limited to:</p> <p>Usefulness in showing the significance of David Low</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to Source J, Low is so influential / significant that "The impression of any political leader which he commits to paper is often liable to become the impression that thousands of people imagine", which may suggest that in a time when there was no television and limited photography, the work of Low is even more significant to the public. • It would be unusual in those times of war for someone to have such unbridled freedom from censorship, especially in contrast to what a paper was supporting or what other cartoonists, e.g. those working at <i>Punch</i> could get away with (idea that comes from Source J), so the fact that Low was given these terms would suggest both he, and his work, were highly significant at the time. • In 1941, Low may not have been considered that significant as his work was only "recently discovered in a small bookshop in Ghuznee Street, Wellington, and purchased by the [Turnbull] Librarian for a modest sum." (Source K). <p>Limitations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources J and K (both written by New Zealanders) clearly show bias / limited and point out very overtly that Low "... has not forgotten his native country" and that he was very generous to his past school (Source J); and "David Low has the New Zealand patriotic spirit" (Source K), suggesting that a historian may need to show caution then as the writers may have overstated the significance of Low due to patriotic / nationalist sentiment. However, Source E shows he is of lasting significance in a more recent account (and one from an Australian), which equally sings his praise and praise for his work. • Limited knowledge of who both authors are, or their expertise in the field; what is their importance? • Significance can be idiosyncratic (with reference to the Sources J and K), i.e. relevant to only New Zealand, or only at that time. However, this limitation may be mitigated by the fact that he appeared to be significant in England / overseas, e.g. Soviet artists and Freud (Source C), Jim Bridges (Source E), and comments about London fame (Source J).