History: Year 7 – King John

Knowledge score out of			

Assessment: Questioning an Interpretation

More ambitious →

Disney suggests that King John was a bad king. How far do you agree with this interpretation of King John?	You give some examples of why John was a good king / bad king / both good and bad. You also say if you agree with Disney that John was a bad king and give a reason why.	As well as giving evidence that he was both good and bad, you begin to explain why this evidence makes you agree or disagree that John was a bad king. You try to explain "how far" you agree that John was bad.	You use detailed historical knowledge and evidence to describe many positive and negative aspects to John's reign. You give some reasons why Disney interpreted King John this way and may explain why you are likely to agree or disagree with Disney. You explain "how far" you agree and demonstrate clear reasoning for your decision.	You fully explain why Disney interpreted John this way and critically evaluate their interpretation. You are also able to explain how and why different interpretations of the same person/event are formed. You also explain the relationships between factors and prove that one argument is stronger than another.
What might this look like?	John was a good king because he made sure people who were accused of a crime got a fair trial but he was bad because he murdered his nephew. Overall, I agree he was a bad king because killing your family is wrong.	John was a good king because he made sure people who were accused of a crime got a fair trial. This makes me disagree that he was a bad king because he made sure everyone in the country was treated fairly. Overall, I mostly agree that he was a bad king because…	In addition to the examples on the left. Disney offered this interpretation of King John because their purpose is to entertain and not educate. It is funnier and more entertaining to have a villain rather than showing both sides to him. Also, their target audience is children so they wouldn't want to confuse them. I wouldn't necessarily agree with Disney's interpretation because… Overall, I mostly agree that he was a bad king because the negatives outweigh the positive. For example…	Disney offers a one-sided interpretation in order to avoid confusing or boring their target audience of children. If this happened, their reputation would decrease and they would lose money. As money and their reputation is more important to them that historical accuracy and they have manipulated the evidence to suit their purpose, I am inclined to reject their interpretation because their motives are questionable. Different interpretations are formed because people will access (or will use) different evidence. In this case, Disney has manipulated the evidence in order to only refer to negative things that John did so they have only offered a negative interpretation of his rule. An historian would no doubt look for evidence from both sides and so they would form a different, and fairer interpretation, of King John. Overall, I mostly agree that King John was a bad king because whilst he made sure justice was being done in courts, this only affected the minority. The whole population was affected by him raising taxes and the Pope shutting churches. Therefore…

Key words and terms: Interpretation, evidence, manipulated, extent, motive, audience.