

Assessment Schedule – 2006

History Scholarship (93403)

Evidence Statement

Skill #1 Argument

Respond to the view expressed in the key idea and communicate your own substantiated argument concerning the impact of developments in Ireland, Scotland, and England on the relationship between the three kingdoms/the relationship between politics, race relations and the economy in New Zealand.

- effectively communicate **sophisticated**, substantiated argument. PD1 (8 or 7 marks)
- **effectively** communicate **substantiated** argument. PD2 (6 or 5 marks)
- **communicate** an **argument**. PD3 (4 marks)
- **[attempt to]** communicate an argument. PD4 (2 marks)

Explanatory notes

1. Candidates whose arguments are *sophisticated* (7 or 8 marks) could have demonstrated this through literacy, fluency, insight, elegance, flair, discernment, complexity and/or originality
2. A candidate will have effectively communicated a *substantiated argument* with a solid argument consistently supported by evidence from the sources and /or their own knowledge (6 marks). A candidate whose argument wavers or drifts in places is likely to gain 5 marks.
3. A candidate who has communicated a relatively simple argument (maybe largely narrative) that is not always supported by evidence or where the argument is in the background rather than explicit should be awarded a mark of 4.
4. A candidate who is awarded 2 marks has attempted to communicate an argument but has really written a narrative.

Content Possibilities (England)

Scholarship candidates are likely to argue that it was the attitude and arrogance of the English to the Scots and Irish that led to their misunderstanding of situations that arose during the period and so impacted on historical events. Candidates should indicate interference in Scottish affairs by England during James' minority. Reference could be made to James' absentee monarchy, 'government by the pen'. With Charles, candidates should refer to his desire for unity and uniformity creating tensions in Scotland. Civil War and the Interregnum brought further complications for the Scots and Irish relationships. A scholarship candidate would also refer to the role Scotland and Ireland played in the Civil War and then their role within the Commonwealth and Protectorate. With the Restoration the return to the status quo should be indicated as well as the further isolation of the other kingdoms from the English monarchy.

Source A sets the scene for complications and dissent in the relationships within the Multiple kingdoms. It puts forward the view that such troubles were not uncommon in this period but points to the monarch's arrogance in ignoring the situations and events in the other kingdoms. This source covers much of the period and raises the issue of religion causing rifts in Ireland and Scotland. Source B indicates the historical nature of English attitudes to the other kingdoms in the British Isles, especially towards the Irish. Source C gives the background to Anglo-Scots relationships and the abhorrence of the English to the idea that a Scots monarch could ever be heir to the English throne.

The resources in this pack should be used as stimulus not as definitive sources upon which to base an argument. Candidates must use their own knowledge to support their discussion. Several of the sources show the xenophobic English attitude towards the Scottish and Irish people. Scholarship candidates could use them to support the argument that the English attitude of superiority led to the concept of the English Empire. The anglo-centric nature of the monarchs and rulers should be noted.

Sources D and E could be used to discuss the concept of Great Britain and how a Scottish King put forward the Union of the kingdoms, which did not proceed because of the intransigent attitude of both the English and Scottish Parliaments.

Sources F and G could be used as a starting point for discussion of English attitudes to the Scots and to show the Scots reaction to the implementation of the Scottish prayer book

A scholarship candidate could use Sources H and I to discuss the plantations of Ireland and the expansion of English rule during Elizabeth's and James' reigns. The discussion could then cover the rebellion of 1641, which was a consequence of settlement. A scholarship candidate could discuss the intense land confiscation and plantation of English settlers, especially soldiers, after the Battle of Drogheda as shown in Source I. This leads to comment on the role of Cromwell and his administration in Ireland after the declaration of the Commonwealth and the union of the three countries under the rule of London. Candidates should compare and contrast this with the treatment of the Scots after the battle of Dunbar.

The sources are arranged in groups, according to the reigns/rulers and not intended as a chronological cover. A Scholarship candidate would need to do more than simply narrate his/her way through the sources. He/she would need to use these sources as a basis for a strong argument based on the original key idea. There should be a strong argument which could be:

- England was just reacting in a similar manner to other European powers and becoming an imperial power.
- That because the three kingdoms were so divided by race, nationality and religion, their relationships would always be fraught with danger especially for the 'major' power, which in itself was in a vulnerable situation both at home and abroad. The Multiple kingdoms complicated relationships within the English nobility and with foreign powers.
- The Scots and Irish were resentful of being relegated to provincial status and dissent grew when the monarch, especially Charles, paid unwelcome attention in their affairs.
- Unpopular actions by the monarch in one kingdom caused repercussions in the others.

Content Possibilities (NZ)

Scholarship candidates will be able to advance clearly, fluently and logically their own argument about the impact of politics in shaping race relations and the economy in the nineteenth century from 1840 until 1890 or some other combination.

Candidates are likely to show in their opening paragraph an argument that establishes the relationship between politics, race relations and the economy. Candidates are likely to acknowledge that there might be other considerations that can be drawn from these three eg law has been signalled in some of the sources as an idea that might be drawn out as an application of politics. Sovereignty and Rangatiratanga might be other ideas that they could pursue but they should relate these to the other two organising ideas. These ideas can be developed further and the resources give them some guidance along that path. Similarly, they might argue that the impact of politics differed depending on which decade is being studied and upon the numbers of European migrants swamping the country. There were regional differences in the extent of the relationship – particularly the North Island experience compared to the South Island experience. Their argument should be clear and sustained throughout their essay.

Source A explains Cowan's idea of racial prejudice shown in the arrogance that the white men showed towards Māori initially although there is clear respect as well. While the ratio of Pākehā to Māori was small each could tolerate the others' different ways. Once the wars started, Pākehā gained respect for Māori ability at fighting and in turn Māori realised that Pākehā fighting ability in certain situations was superior to their own. Scholarship candidates should be able to supplement this source with their own ideas because there is a link to land and to assertions of sovereignty that taken with the suggestion of increased numbers of Europeans is significant for the relationship between politics and race relations and the economy. They might include reference to the consequences of the Northern War where no land was confiscated.

Sources B1 and B2 are both about the Otago gold rush but for the argument there are two connectors: firstly while war is raging in the North Island, males are flooding into the South Island and secondly, it is a dangerous place with limited political control. Some might mention the treatment of the Chinese on the goldfields as a reference to race relations but really the economic stimulus of gold is what is the prime driving force in the goldfield regions, while the dominant issue at the same time in the North Island is political or is it economic? – Sinclair versus Belich here.

Source C emphasises that even by 1890 land was still a significant part of life because so many people depended upon the infrastructure that the land-based industries created. A scholarship candidate could ask the question that a dependent economy such as the New Zealand's was susceptible to fluctuations (borne out by the impact of the 1880s) and thus challenge the impact of politics on race relations and the economy.

Source D1 is a map of alienated land in the North Island whether it be from raupatu or from crown purchase. A link could be made between the political decision to use war against Māori and the consequence of that engagement for both Māori and Pākehā both politically and economically.

Source E1 provides evidence that involvement in the political process was the preserve of a wealthy few and for the most part up until late in the century there was a high degree of apathy about elections and politics. In addition, until 1893, women were not part of that process. And yet the decisions made were significant if we consider E2 which is Vogel's speech supporting his bill to expend money on a massive scheme to invest in public works and immigration. It seems that politics can have a profound impact on economics whether it be by central government's actions to stimulate the economy or through the implementation of laws that are passed by parliament. It is no coincidence that the degree of tension in race relations subsided in the 1870s because of the extensive public works that employed many Māori.

Source F1 contrasts specific local economic activity (the construction of a dry dock) with F2 showing the provincial governments across the regions of the country (until 1876). The distinction can be made between central government and provincial government – both nonetheless politics, and their links with economic activity. Politics at a local level has a closer relationship to both race relations and economics in certain parts of the country.

Source G uses metaphor to explain the changing relationship between Pākehā and Māori as the latter became swamped as the century progressed. How a candidate uses 'swamping' and links it to economics or race relations or politics is important to their argument.

Source H1 is evidence of the process by which the Native Land Court and therefore the machinery of the law was far more effective in marginalising Māori through alienating their land than war and the confiscations were. Despite the protestations of Māori, this source and Source H2 show a clear link between politics, race relations and economy.

Source I concerns Parihaka and is a graphic illustration of 'purpose-built legislation' to address a particular race relations problem that has profound impact on the economy as the surveyors sanctioned by the raupatu, opened up that part of Taranaki to settlers and in the process showed a pragmatic use of the law to achieve the end that was desired. This is Belich's 'creeping confiscation'. The denial of due process by politicians for the Parihaka protesters could be cited alongside their own knowledge of creeping confiscation.

The sources have been arranged in a random order so that relationships can be drawn in time and place as well as in the connection between politics, race relations and the economy. A Scholarship candidate would need to do more than simply narrate his/her way through the sources. He/she would need to use these sources as a basis for an argument based on the original key idea. In a sense they are a strong stimulus to thinking about possible arguments.

Historical Relationships (Skill #4)

Demonstrate an understanding of historical relationships relevant to this historical issue, such as cause and effect, past and present, specific and general, continuity and change, and pattern and trends

- demonstrate a **thorough** and **perceptive** understanding of historical relationships in selected contexts and settings. PD1 (8 or 7 marks)
- demonstrate **an informed understanding** of historical relationships in selected contexts and settings. PD2 (6 or 5 marks)
- demonstrate **an understanding** of historical relationships in selected contexts and settings. PD3 (4 marks)
- **attempt** to demonstrate an understanding of historical relationships in selected contexts and settings. PD4 (2 marks)

Explanatory notes

1. A candidate can demonstrate their understanding of historical relationships either implicitly or explicitly. Markers should use the mark given to the candidate for argument as a guide to their marking of this skill.

Content possibilities (England)

The Scholarship candidate will implicitly show an awareness of historical relationships. These could include relationships such as cause and effect, past and present, specific and general, continuity and change, and patterns and trends, eg:

- England and Ireland in the various reigns. Ireland was in essence a colony of England's despite being called a kingdom. The English monarchs had taken the title in 1541 having been overlords since the twelfth century.
- The fact that Scotland had until 1603 been a foreign power – did this result in a different response from England?
- Religious changes which impacted on all the kingdoms.
- Changes/continuation, indifference and interference during James' monarchy.
- The complications of foreign policy especially for Scotland who was allied with France, one of the major enemies of England.
- The plantations were a cause of friction.
- Impact of Civil War
- That the Scots were shocked at the English executing Charles and their support of his son.
- Interregnum and Restoration.

Content possibilities (NZ)

The Scholarship candidate will implicitly show an awareness of historical relationships. These could include relationships such as cause and effect, past and present, specific and general, continuity and change, and pattern and trends, eg:

- increased Pākehā population leads to pressure on Māori land, war, and confiscation (cause and effect)
- differing interpretations of the Treaty lead to political decisions that have profound effects on race relations (past and present)
- reservations could be made about the relevance of localised economic activity as we generalise it to apply to the whole of New Zealand (specific and general)
- continuity and change in Māori reaction to assertions of sovereignty in other parts of the country (Ngapuhi not involved with wars of 1860s and many kaupapa fought on the Imperial side)
- patterns and trends highlighted by contrasting Māori response coupled with changing Pākehā action over different time periods

Synthesis of Ideas (Skill #5)

Integrate relevant ideas about this historical issue from the evidence in the sources and your own knowledge to develop your argument.

- synthesise, with **perception** and **insight**, ideas relevant to the historical context(s) and setting(s). PD1 (8 or 7 marks)
- **synthesise** ideas relevant to the historical context(s) and setting(s). PD2 (6 or 5 marks)
- **identify ideas** relevant to the historical contexts and settings. PD3 (4 or 3 marks)
- **attempt** to identify ideas relevant to the historical contexts and settings. PD4 (2 marks or 1 mark)

Explanatory notes

1. A candidate who gains 7 or 8 marks for this skill needs to have provided an insightful and perceptive integration of ideas from their own knowledge and the sources provided in order to enhance their argument.
2. A candidate who gains 6 marks is likely to have brought in plenty of accurate and relevant detail from their own knowledge and integrated this appropriately with the sources provided in to their argument. A candidate who gains 5 will also have done this but their synthesis might be more awkward or less balanced.
3. A candidate gaining either 4 marks or 3 marks is likely to have brought in a little bit of their own knowledge (although this might not always be directly relevant to the argument – more of a side track) and/or have provided some decent paraphrasing of the sources into their article. Candidates who take a source-by-source approach and don't integrate the evidence from the sources into a well structured argument will fall in to this category (at best) as they will not have demonstrated the skill of synthesis needed for PD2.
4. A candidate gaining either 1 or 2 marks would either fail to use any/much of their own knowledge or make little or no reference to the sources provided.

Content possibilities (England and NZ)

For the type of ideas that a candidate might draw from the sources to incorporate into their argument, see content possibilities for argument (skill #1). There is scope for candidates to organise the integration of their own ideas with the ideas contained in the sources.

Evaluating Historical Narratives (Skill #3)

Evaluate historians' interpretations and the views of contemporaries that relate to this historical issue

- critically evaluate historical narratives [**sustained**]. PD1 (8 marks)
- **critically evaluate** historical narratives. PD2 (6 marks)
- **evaluate** historical narratives. PD3 (4 or 3 marks)
- **attempt** to evaluate historical narratives. PD4 (2 marks or 1 mark)

Explanatory notes

1. A candidate who gains 8 marks will need to consistently throughout their article make judgements about historical narratives and explain *why* they have made these judgements. To reach this category, these judgements would need to show an insightful understanding about the nature of the issue or the perspective of the historian and/or the contemporary. This evaluation needs to be sustained.
2. The key word for a mark of 6 is “critical”. A candidate gaining a mark in this category would need to make judgements about historical narratives and explain *why* they have made these judgements. To reach this category, these judgements would need to show an insightful understanding about the nature of the issue or perspective of the historian/contemporary.
3. A candidate will be deemed to have *evaluate[d] historical narratives* if he or she has correctly and accurately used the views of historians and/or contemporaries in his/her argument and has made some simple judgements about the validity of these views. This would include using the views of one historian/contemporary to evaluate another. A student would have to make several of these simple judgments in order to gain a mark of 4 (or have fewer but stronger evaluative points).
4. A candidate who gains either 2 marks (at least one genuine attempt) or 1 mark (a glimmer!) has to have attempted to make an evaluative comment about the views of historians and/or contemporaries concerning the historical issue.

Content possibilities (England)

The scholarship candidate might:

- comment in particular about the ‘revisionist’ nature of history writing: is there anything here that is no longer ‘fashionable’ (eg Weldon’s views of James), or has advanced beyond traditional interpretations?
- discuss the ideas that James was a much more successful king and that his ideas of union were before their time.
- place the narratives in the context of the time
- include discussion of views of contemporaries/narratives not referred to in the sources and critique them, possibly through using the views that are contained in the sources or vice-versa.
- outline the changes that occurred in the relationships of the multiple kingdoms over the period.

Content possibilities (NZ)

The Scholarship candidate might:

- refer to the arguments of Sinclair, Belich and Cowan over the causes of the wars.
- refer to the differing perspectives and attitudes of Māori historians by contrast.
- include discussion of views of contemporaries not referred to in the sources and critique them, possibly through using the views that are contained in the sources or vice-versa (eg critique Sinclair by reference to James Belich’s arguments)
- be prepared to challenge sources that do not sit well with evidence that the candidate brings into the exam.
- refer to Hawke and the debate over the 1880s depression in the context of New Zealand’s economic dependency.
- mention of the Waitangi Tribunal and its contribution to our knowledge and understanding since 1975 might be a useful reference point.

Judgements about Evidence/Research (Skill #2)

Make judgements about the nature of historical evidence concerning this historical issue

- **develop informed and perceptive** judgements about the nature of historical evidence and/or historical research. PD1 (8 marks or 7 marks)
- make ***informed*** judgements about the nature of historical evidence and/or historical research. PD2 (6 marks or 5 marks)
- **make valid judgements** about the nature of historical evidence and/or research. PD3 (4 marks or 3 marks)
- **attempt** to make valid judgements about the nature of historical evidence and/or research. PD4 (2 marks or 1 mark)

Explanatory notes

1. A candidate who gains 8 or 7 marks will be both *informed* and *perceptive*. Perceptive comments will stand out to the marker and are likely to show not just an understanding of the issue from what they have been taught (informed) but also an understanding of the critical underpinnings of the process of historical research and study. What evidence is not available to historians either now or in the past?
2. A candidate who gains 5 or 6 marks will be *informed*. This means that their judgements [plural] need to be accurate and based on their informed knowledge of the historical issue.
3. A candidate who is awarded either 3 or 4 marks will have made some simple or obvious but valid judgements [more than one] about the nature of the historical evidence available to them as they address the historical issue. They are likely to use phrases such as “limitation”, “reliability”, “validity”, “usefulness”, “bias”, “propaganda”, “selection”, “appropriate”, “representative” etc (also applicable above and below). A candidate gaining a 4 is likely to have made more of these sorts of low level judgements than a candidate gaining 3.
4. A candidate who gains either 2 marks (at least one genuine attempt) or 1 mark (a glimmer!) has to have attempted to make a judgement about the nature of the historical evidence available to them as they address the historical issue.

Content possibilities (England)

The Scholarship candidate might:

- comment on the need for more specific evidence from the source selection; eg financial costs of the English administration in Ireland,
- discuss the nature of evidence: are these sources biased to show that the English just detested the other nations and so had no hope of understanding or working constructively with them?
- comment on the obvious bias and propaganda. The images of the Irish rebellion were used as propaganda to create a climate of fear amongst the English so that they would distrust any moves of Charles to control the army in Ireland.
- critique the ideas of union of the crowns
- raise the question of France being included in James’ titles.
- discuss the reasons behind the vitriolic writing of Weldon and other historians.
- analyse the contents of the sources commenting on their representativeness, usefulness and reliability.

Content possibilities (NZ)

The Scholarship candidate might

- comment on the need for more specific evidence from the source selection (regional variations, the experiences of kūpapa, population statistics, more primary material).
- discuss the limitations of some sources relative to others. What reasons other than war and confiscation led to Māori land loss? What happened to Māori land in the South Island? What are the different ways that politics are shown through the resources? What is missing?
- comment on the limitations of single pieces of evidence such as the gold field sources which provides evidence for the Otago Gold Rushes but not much else. The dry dock visual is a single item that needs further explanation because there could be comments that could be made about the changes in technology that relate to transportation as well as in the technology of preserving the produce (refrigeration) – both link to economics but can they also link to politics and race relations?
- make a judgement about whether the evidence from one part of the country can apply to the economic, political or race relations situation in another part of the country eg because they are explaining the relationship between politics, race relations and the economy it is easy to over-emphasise one item of evidence and generalise from the particular.

- comment on the limitations of the West Coast act of parliament because it was of such narrow applicability, although it is a demonstration of how the law can be used.

Understanding of question / context (Skill #6)

<i>Demonstrate an understanding of this historical issue through breadth, depth, and balanced coverage.</i>
--

- **demonstrate an understanding** of the **critical underpinnings** and scope of an historical question / context. PD1 (8 or 7 marks)
- **understand and define** the scope of an historical question / context. PD2 (6 or 5 marks)
- **demonstrate some understanding** of the scope of an historical question / context. PD3 (4 or 3 marks)
- **attempt to demonstrate some understanding** of the scope of an historical question / context. PD4 (2 mark or 1 mark)

Explanatory notes

1. Markers should use the marks that the candidate has been awarded for skills 1, 4 and 5 and to a lesser extent skills 2 and 3 as a guide for their marking of skill 6. How well does the candidate understand the issue they have been discussing? Is there *breadth*, *depth* and *balanced coverage*?

Content possibilities (England and New Zealand)

A scholarship candidate could discuss this topic in many different ways. It could be covered chronologically or it could be discussed country by country. It is important that candidates add their own knowledge so that coverage is broad, deep and balanced.

NEW ZEALAND SCHOLARSHIP 2006
PERFORMANCE SUMMARY FOR HISTORY

The individual skills in each descriptor have been assigned a numerical value with the skills in Performance Descriptor 1 assigned a value of 8, in Performance Descriptor 2 assigned a value of 6, in Performance Descriptor 3 assigned a value of 4, in Performance Descriptor 4 assigned a value of 2. Where a candidate is deemed to be an incremental step below they can be awarded 7, 5, 3, 1 respectively to further discriminate the historical skills. Candidates may well demonstrate evidence in different descriptors and an example is outlined below.

Example one;

A candidate demonstrating the following skills all from Performance Descriptor 1

- **Skill 1:** effectively communicate sophisticated, substantiated argument = 8
- **Skill 2:** develop informed and perceptive judgements about the nature of historical evidence and /or historical research = 8
- **Skill 3:** critically evaluate historical narratives = 8
- **Skill 4:** demonstrate a thorough and perceptive understanding of historical relationships in selected contexts and settings = 8
- **Skill 5:** synthesise, with perception and insight, ideas relevant to the historical context(s) and setting(s) = 8
- **Skill 6:** demonstrate an understanding of the critical underpinnings and scope of an historical question /context = 8.

Total: 48

Example two;

A candidate demonstrating following skills all from Performance Descriptor 2 and Performance Descriptor 3

- **Skill 1:** effectively communicate substantiated argument = 6
- **Skill 2:** make informed judgements about the nature of historical evidence and /or historical research = 6
- **Skill 3:** critically evaluate historical narratives = 6
- **Skill 4:** demonstrate an understanding historical relationships in selected contexts and settings = 6
- **Skill 5:** identify ideas relevant to the historical contexts and settings = 4
- **Skill 6:** demonstrate some understanding of the scope of an historical question /context = 4

Total: 32

Marking Cover Sheet

All markers are required to use the marking cover sheet, and record comments and marks concerning each skill before they transfer the marks into the back flap of the candidates' answer booklets. A copy of the cover sheet is on the following page.

Candidate #: _____ Option: *Topic One (England) or Topic Two (New Zealand)*

<p>Argument (Skill #1) <i>Respond to the view expressed in the key idea and communicate your own substantiated argument concerning the impact of developments in Ireland, Scotland, and England on the relationship between the three kingdoms / the relationship between politics, race relations and the economy in New Zealand.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> effectively communicate sophisticated, substantiated argument. PD1 (8 or 7) effectively communicate substantiated argument. PD2 (6 or 5) communicate an argument. PD3 (4) attempt to communicate an argument. PD4 (2) 	<p>Evaluating Historical Narratives (Skill #3) <i>Evaluate historians' interpretations and the views of contemporaries that relate to this historical issue</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> critically evaluate historical narratives (sustained). PD1 (8) critically evaluate historical narratives. PD2 (6) evaluate historical narratives. PD3 (4 or 3) attempt to evaluate historical narratives. PD4 (2 or 1)
<p>Historical Relationships (Skill #4) <i>Demonstrate an understanding of historical relationships relevant to this historical issue, such as cause and effect, past and present, specific and general, continuity and change, and pattern and trends</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrate a thorough and perceptive understanding of historical relationships in selected contexts and settings. PD1 (8 or 7) demonstrate an informed understanding of historical relationships in selected contexts and settings. PD2 (6 or 5) demonstrate an understanding of historical relationships in selected contexts and settings. PD3 (4) attempt to demonstrate an understanding of historical relationships in selected contexts and settings. PD4 (2) 	<p>Judgements about Evidence / Research (Skill #2) <i>Make judgements about the nature of historical evidence concerning this historical issue</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop informed and perceptive judgements about the nature of historical evidence and / or historical research. PD1 (8 or 7) make informed judgements about the nature of historical evidence and / or historical research. PD2 (6 or 5) make valid judgements about the nature of historical evidence and / or research. PD3 (4 or 3) attempt to make valid judgements about the nature of historical evidence and / or research. PD4 (2 or 1)
<p>Synthesis of Ideas (Skill #5) <i>Integrate relevant ideas about this historical issue from the evidence in the sources and your own knowledge to develop your argument.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> synthesise, with perception and insight, ideas relevant to the historical context(s) and setting(s). PD1 (8 or 7) synthesise ideas relevant to the historical context(s) and setting(s). PD2 (6 or 5) identify ideas relevant to the historical contexts and settings. PD3 (4 or 3) attempt to identify ideas relevant to the historical contexts and settings. PD4 (2 or 1) 	<p>Understanding of question / context (Skill #6) <i>Demonstrate an understanding of this historical issue through breadth, depth, and balanced coverage.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrate an understanding of the critical underpinnings and scope of an historical question / context. PD1 (8 or 7) understand and define the scope of an historical question / context. PD2 (6 or 5) demonstrate some understanding of the scope of an historical question / context. PD3 (4 or 3) attempt to demonstrate some understanding of the scope of an historical question / context. PD4 (2 or 1)