

Q.1 State and examine the objections raised against the objectivity of History. Also, analyse the response of various historians in defense of History. Discuss whether History is a Science or Art? Bring out the points of convergence and divergence between Science and History.

ANS

In the Preface of his first major work, *History of the Latin and Teutonic Nations from 1494 to 1514* (1824), Ranke wrote that the job of the historian is to present the past as it had actually happened. To achieve this he had outlined several guidelines that a historian has to adhere to while writing history such as using only validated facts and ridding oneself of prejudices and moral judgments against the object that was investigated. Ranke lamented that in the past history was diverted from its actual purpose and had been used to judge the past so that the future generation would benefit from that. This, Ranke argued, was not the job of history or historians. He cautioned historians against allowing their own judgements in recreating the past lest the degree of objectivity in their work would be compromised. He stressed that only when a historian removed all traces of his personal feelings and opinions could he ever produce an objective historical work (Boldt n. d., 2–12). Ranke advocated this view in the first quarter of the 19th century. Since Ranke's view had created a strong impact among historians sometimes it is mistakenly assumed that the effort to write objective history began only since the time of Ranke. But, this is not correct. Actually, the yearning to write objective history had always been a practice among historians since the time of Herodotus itself. Herodotus travelled to almost all the countries involved in the Persian War, including the countries of enemies, and interviewed as many witnesses as possible to ensure that facts presented in his *Persian Wars* were accurate. He had used some kind of critical analysis to ascertain that the information given by the witnesses was true and correct (see Brown 1954, 829–833). Thucydides, who had actually received inspiration to write history from Herodotus, had also tried to write objective history. His work, the *Peloponnesian War*, was a documentation of a contemporary incident, the Greek civil war, fought by Athens and its empire against the Peloponnesian League led by Sparta. Thucydides chose to write the history of contemporary incident because he felt historians can vouch for objectivity only for contemporary occurrences. He took pain to seek not only as much facts as possible but also to ensure that the facts were true (Brown 1954, 834 and 840). His ingenuity in evidence-gathering, ascertaining the accuracy of the gathered facts and analysing the cause and effect of the Peloponnesian War without reference to intervention of the gods had made Thucydides to be regarded as the father of scientific history

In Defense of History

The classic explanation of the craft of history and the vital worth of historians to civilization In this volume, English historian Richard Evans offers a defence of the importance of his craft. At a time when fact and historical truth are under unprecedented assault, Evans shows us why history is necessary. Taking us into the historians' workshop to show us just how good history gets written, he demolishes the wilder claims of postmodern historians, who deny the possibility of any realistic grasp of history, and explains the deadly political dangers of losing a historical perspective on the way we live our lives.

Richard J. Evans is Regius Professor Emeritus of History at Cambridge University, and Provost of Gresham College in the City of London. He has taught at the University of East Anglia, where he was Professor of European History, and Birkbeck, University of London, where he was Professor of History and Vice-Master. His many books include *The Coming of the Third Reich* (2003), *The Third Reich in Power* (2005) and *The Third Reich at War* (2008), as well as a collection of essays, *The Third Reich in History and Memory* (2015). His most recent books are *Altered Pasts: Counterfactuals in History* (2013) and *The Pursuit of Power: Europe 1815-1914* (2016).

Q.2 Examine the statement of E. H. extent we can rely on biographies, biography is a bad history” to what an autobiographies, and Travelogues in research? Supplement your arguments with examples.

ANS

any member of an ethical review body reviewing that research;

- those involved in research governance; and
- potential research participants.

The National Statement is developed jointly by the National Health and Medical Research Council, the Australian Research Council and Universities Australia.

The National Statement is subject to rolling review. This means that parts of the National Statement will be updated as needed, rather than reviewing the entire document every five years.

Compliance with the National Statement is a prerequisite for receipt of NHMRC funding.

All human interaction, including the interaction involved in human research, has ethical dimensions. However, ‘ethical conduct’ is more than simply doing the right thing. It involves acting in the right spirit, out of an abiding respect and concern for

one's fellow creatures. This National Statement on 'ethical conduct in human research' is therefore oriented to something more fundamental than ethical 'do's' and 'don'ts' – namely, an ethos that should permeate the way those engaged in human research approach all that they do in their research.

Human research is research conducted with or about people, or their data or tissue. It has contributed enormously to human good. Much human research carries little risk and in Australia the vast majority of human research has been carried out in a safe and ethically responsible manner. But human research can involve significant risks and it is possible for things to go wrong. Sometimes risks are realised despite the best of intentions and care in planning and practice. Sometimes they are realised because of technical error or ethical insensitivity, neglect or disregard. On rare occasions the practice of research has even involved the deliberate and appalling violation of human beings – notoriously, the Second World War experiments in detention and concentration camps.

This range of possibilities can give rise to important and sometimes difficult ethical questions about research participation. Two considerations give further weight to those questions. First, research participants may enter into a relationship with researchers whom they may not know but need to trust. This trust adds to the ethical responsibility borne by those in whom it is placed. Secondly, many who contribute as participants in human research do so altruistically, for the common good, without thought of recompense for their time and effort. This underscores the importance of protecting research patients.

Since earliest times, human societies have pondered the nature of ethics and its requirements and have sought illumination on ethical questions in the writings of philosophers, novelists, poets and sages, in the teaching of religions, and in everyday individual thinking. Reflection on the ethical dimensions of medical research, in particular, has a long history, reaching back to classical Greece and beyond. Practitioners of human research in many other fields have also long reflected upon the ethical questions raised by what they do. There has, however, been increased attention to ethical reflection about human research since the Second World War. The judgment of the Nuremberg military tribunal included ten principles about permissible medical experiments, since referred to as the Nuremberg Code. Discussion of these principles led the World Medical Assembly in 1964 to adopt what came to be known as the Helsinki Declaration, revised several times since then. The various international human rights instruments that have also emerged since the Second World War emphasise the importance of protecting human beings in many spheres of community life. During this period, written ethical guidelines have also been generated in many areas of research practice as an expression of professional responsibility.

But what is the justification for ethical research guidelines as extensive as this National Statement, and for its wide-reaching practical authority?

The National Statement has been extended to address many issues not discussed in the previous version, or discussed in less detail. This is in response to requests for clearer guidance for those conducting research and those involved in its ethical review. At the same time, without compromising the protection of participants, the revised National Statement provides for greater flexibility in the practice of ethical review, depending on the type and area of research and the degree of risk involved.

Research often involves public interaction between people that serves a public good. There is, therefore, a public responsibility for seeing that these interactions are ethically acceptable to the Australian community. That responsibility is acknowledged and given effect in the wide-reaching authority of this National Statement, which sets out national standards for the ethical design, review and conduct of human research. Its content reflects the outcome of wide consultation with Australian communities who participate in, design, conduct, fund, manage and publish human research.

Creating work environments for nurses that are most conducive to patient safety will require fundamental changes throughout many health care organizations (HCOs)—in the ways work is designed and personnel are deployed, and how the very culture of the organization understands and acts on the science of safety. These changes require leadership capable of transforming not just a physical environment, but also the beliefs and practices of nurses and other health care workers providing care in that environment and those in the HCO who establish the policies and practices that shape the environment—the individuals who constitute the management of the organization.

Behavioral and organizational research on work and workforce effectiveness, health services research, studies of organizational disasters and their evolution, and studies of high-reliability organizations (see [Chapter 1](#)) have identified management practices that are consistently associated with successful implementation of change initiatives and achievement of safety in spite of high risk for error. These practices include (1) balancing the tension between production efficiency and reliability (safety), (2) creating and sustaining trust throughout the organization, (3) actively managing the process of change, (4) involving workers in decision making pertaining to work design and work flow, and (5) using knowledge management practices to establish the organization as a “learning organization.” These five management practices, which are essential to keeping patients safe, are not applied consistently in the work environments of nurses.

Q.3 Explain the different classifications of sources and evaluate the difference between primary and secondary sources. Also highlight the methods of analysis, evaluation and use of secondary sources.

ANS

Evidence is which tends to prove or disapprove something. There are different classifications of evidence namely; the Direct Evidence, the Indirect or Circumstantial Evidence, Real Evidence, Personal Evidence, Original Evidence and Unoriginal Evidence or Hearsay Evidence.

Direct evidence is the evidence such as those testimonies made by some individuals. The one who made the testimony speaks from his or her experience or personal knowledge with regards to the subject matter. The direct evidence declares that a certain fact

exists.

Indirect or circumstantial evidence is the evidence that requires an inference to connect to a conclusion or fact. It allows a trier of fact in order to deduce a fact exists.

The real evidence is the evidence that is presented directly to the one that will make the judgment; maybe through the different senses. One example of this is the injury that was being committed as being shown.

Personal evidence is the evidence that is afforded by human agent. It could either be in the way of discourse or in the way of voluntary signs that is made to be able to communicate thought.

Original evidence is the evidence that possesses an independent force of probability on its own.

Unoriginal or hearsay evidence

is the evidence made by a person who says some fact base upon the information that he she acquired from the others.

The evidence can be tested by the quality of the evidence itself and by the sources of the evidence.

In testing the evidence by its quality, it should be asked if the evidence is consistent with the human nature as well as the human experience; if the evidence is consistent with known facts; if the evidence is consistent with itself; if the evidence passed the "hearsay test" and if the evidence is a kind that is exceptionally valuable.

In testing the evidence by its source, the ordinary fact witnesses should be tested as well as the sources of expert evidence.

Evidences should be checked carefully since evidence can bring the verdict whether a certain thing is true or not. It should be remembered that there are saying that says"

Figures does not lie but liars do figure”. In other words, one might fabricate evidence against someone else; the reason why every evidence should be properly checked.

Primary Sources are directly taken from an individual or group of individuals, while secondary sources take information from an individual or group and analyzes the topic. Remembering this information helps in deciding whether it is a primary or secondary source.

Primary sources are **first-hand accounts of a topic while secondary sources are any account of something that is not a primary source**. Published research, newspaper articles, and other media are typical secondary sources. Secondary sources can, however, cite both primary sources and secondary sources. Not all evidence is of equal value and weight.

The most common qualitative methods include:

- Content Analysis, for analyzing behavioral and verbal data.
- Narrative Analysis, for working with data culled from interviews, diaries, surveys.
- Grounded Theory, for developing causal explanations of a given event by studying and extrapolating from one or more past cases.

businesses today need every edge and advantage they can get. Thanks to obstacles like rapidly changing markets, economic uncertainty, shifting political landscapes, finicky consumer attitudes, and even global pandemics, businesses today are working with slimmer margins for error.

Companies that want to not only stay in business but also thrive can improve their odds of success by making smart choices. And how does an individual or organization make these choices? They do it by collecting as much useful, actionable information as possible, then using it to make better-informed decisions!

This strategy is common sense, and it applies to personal life as well as business. No one makes important decisions without first finding out what’s at stake, the pros and cons, and the possible outcomes. Similarly, no company that wants to succeed should make decisions based on ignorance. Organizations need information; they need data.

This need for data is why the discipline of data analysis enters into the picture. In this article we will cover the following topics to give you complete understanding of data analysis:

- What is data analysis?
- What is the data analysis process?
- What types of data analysis are there?
- Data analysis methods
- How to become a data analyst

Tajassus.com