

Assessment Schedule – 2005

Scholarship: History (93403)

A nine point marking scale (0-8) was used to assess each question.

Skill #1 Argument

Respond to the view expressed in the key idea and communicate your own substantiated argument concerning the degree of religious uniformity in England between 1558 and 1667 / the impact of colonisation and Pākehā settlement on Māori, and Māori responses in the nineteenth century.

- Effectively communicate **sophisticated**, substantiated argument. Performance Descriptor (PD)1 (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 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 made an attempt to communicate an argument or has written a competent accurate narrative.

Content Possibilities (England 1558–1667):

Scholarship candidates are likely to argue that while the desire for religious uniformity might have existed in the minds of the rulers, it was never a likely proposition in England for a variety of reasons. Implementation of uniformity was very difficult due to the lack of a paid civil service. A candidate could explain that each monarch faced internal and external challenges and that Parliament's increasing involvement in religious matters made uniformity highly unlikely. A Scholarship candidate would evaluate the extent to which uniformity was gained by each monarch over the course of his or her reign. They would be expected to refer to Elizabeth, James, Charles I, Cromwell and Charles II. A Scholarship candidate would also discuss the role of popular religion.

Source A suggests that religion was very important to the community, and candidates could expand on this view, linking religion to a nationalistic theme; that no ruler wanted a faith that relied on foreign control. All candidates would be expected to draw on the Elizabethan Settlement as the starting point on the hoped-for path to religious uniformity. This is too important a theme to ignore in the overall question, and there is a resource to point them down this pathway.

There are resources in the pack that look at both Catholicism and Puritanism as barriers to religious uniformity; candidates would be expected to use some of them and expand on them. For example, in Resource C1, James is unwilling to see Catholics multiply; while in Resource C2, he will tolerate Catholicism in private and seek to revoke anti-Catholic laws. Resource C2 conveys the view of support for Catholicism at the highest levels, leading to the conclusion that, while the king was prepared to deal with the Spanish about Catholicism in England, religious uniformity was threatened.

Candidates should be able to make comments about the consistency of each of the monarchs as governor / head of the Anglican Church in maintaining uniformity in the face of internal and external challenges. Given the vagaries of personal monarchy and the increasing involvement of Parliament in contentious religious matters, one could argue that religious uniformity in England over 150 years was never likely.

The central administration's view of what was the official English church and how it should be maintained at the local level was not only subject to change through the period, but its peculiar blend of doctrine and ritual also caused

contemporaries to view it from different perspectives: to some it was a reformed (non-papist) Catholic Church, and to others, a conservative Protestant Church. Using Resources D–G, candidates should acknowledge the complex variety of Protestant non-conformity and recognise the gradual shift over the period in more radical Protestant attempts to change the Church from within to opposing it from without while, in some cases, seeking to dilute the state church's institutional capacity to impose uniformity. There should be some discussion about the variety of opinion historians have had about the nature and impact of the Puritan challenge to the established Anglican Church and its link to the context of such events as the Thirty Years' War in Europe, 1618–1648.

Resources F through to I introduce the confused period of the Civil War and candidates should be comfortable with the introduction of the military involvement in religion. The period of the Civil War and its aftermath challenged the concept of religious uniformity, and candidates would have to refer to at least some of these resources to show the rise of the sects, the development of Independents and the problems for Cromwell's form of 'toleration'.

The last two resources refer to the Restoration period; and should promote a discussion of the return to the concept of a narrow state-wide religious uniformity and social stability as documented in Clarendon's Code. It is here that a candidate would begin to round off their argument, and show that the Restoration provided the best chance for religious uniformity. The Clarendon Code removed the dissenters, and the toleration for Catholics as hinted at by Charles II in Resource J1 never eventuated.

The Resources provided show a chronological development through the period. A Scholarship candidate, however, will do more than tell the story as indicated by these resources; he / she will use these resources as a basis for a strong argument based on the end two lines of the original quotation, that the idea of religious uniformity in England was unlikely to be accepted or implemented.

Content Possibilities (New Zealand in the Nineteenth Century):

Scholarship candidates will be able to advance clearly, fluently, and logically their own arguments about the impact of colonisation and Pākehā settlement on Māori during the nineteenth century.

Candidates are likely to acknowledge the complexities of nineteenth-century New Zealand race relations and reject 'fatal impact' type arguments as too simplistic. Candidates may argue that Māori embraced some aspects of Europe and rejected others, and that to a large extent Māori were agents of their own change in the nineteenth century, making decisions of their own for their own benefit.

Candidates are likely to acknowledge that there was not one impact or one response, but a variety of outcomes and responses. Source A shows Māori land loss (and some retention) in the North Island in the nineteenth century, and Source B refers to the loss of mana (including land, settlements, fisheries, and other taonga) that Māori experienced in the nineteenth century. Source C describes the problems that one iwi experienced in its interaction with the Crown in the nineteenth century.

Scholarship candidates should be able to supplement this evidence of loss and grievance with evidence from their own knowledge about the negative outcomes that were experienced by Māori in the nineteenth century.

Source D emphasises continuity, with Pākehā tools and ideas enhancing whānau and iwi structures rather than undermining them.

Source E shows that some Māori not only embraced Christianity, but also honoured it in a 'traditional' way; this is typical of the way that many Māori responded to new Pākehā ideas. Good candidates should be able to present further examples of this sort of agency from their own studies.

Source F introduces the idea of 'dual agency'. This source could provide the springboard for a good answer as it touches on several key points that the candidates should be able to expand on from their own knowledge.

Similarly, Belich in Source G casts considerable doubt on the 'fatal impact' thesis, while acknowledging that some Māori suffered largely because they were such eager agents of their own change.

Source H emphasises Māori decision making, enterprise, and intertribal cooperation for economic gain. The final two sources refer to pan-tribal Māori responses to colonisation and attacks on their land.

The sources have been arranged so that those that emphasise negative outcomes for Māori are presented first and those that emphasise Māori agency and resistance follow. 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.

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 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 or 1 marks)

Explanatory notes:

1. Candidates 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 1558–1667):

The Scholarship candidate will 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:

- Elizabeth's reluctance to alienate Catholics encouraged some to continue Catholic practices in their own homes (Sources B1 and B2: cause and effect)
- the looseness of the description of 'Puritans' compared with the sects that did eventually emerge (Sources D and H2: specific and general)
- the Church that emerged under Cromwell after the Civil War (Source I: continuity and change).

Content possibilities (New Zealand in the Nineteenth Century):

The Scholarship candidate will 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)
- changing representation of Māori over time – 'fatal impact' → 'Māori agency' → 'Waitangi Tribunal emphasis on grievance' (past and present)
- the specific experience of Ngāti Apa in comparison to other Māori groups (specific and general)
- continuity and changes in Māori housing, belief, economy, tribal and pan-tribal structures (continuity and change)
- patterns and trends associated with Māori land loss, tribalism and pan tribalism, types of resistance, etc (patterns and trends).

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:

- Candidates who gain 7 or 8 marks for this skill need to have provided an insightful and perceptive integration of ideas from their own knowledge and the sources provided in order to enhance their arguments.
- Candidates who gain 6 or 5 marks are likely to have brought in plenty of accurate and relevant detail from their own knowledge and integrated this appropriately in to their arguments.
- Candidates gaining either 4 marks or 3 marks are 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 articles. 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.
- Candidates 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 (Both topics):

For the types of ideas that candidates might draw from the sources to incorporate into their arguments, see content possibilities for Argument (Skill #1)

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. Candidates who gain 7 or 8 marks will need to make judgements about historical narratives and explain *why* they have made these judgements consistently throughout their articles. 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 / contemporary. This evaluation needs to be sustained.
2. The key word for a mark of either 5 or 6 is 'critical'. Candidates 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. Candidates will be deemed to have *evaluated historical narratives* if they have correctly and accurately used the views of historians and / or contemporaries in their arguments, and have made some simple judgements about the validity of these views. This would include using the views of one historian / contemporary to evaluate another. Candidates would have to make several of these simple judgements 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 1558–1667):

The Scholarship candidate might:

- comment in particular about the 'revisionist' nature of history writing; is there anything here that is no longer 'fashionable' (eg Neale's Puritan Choir), or has advanced beyond traditional interpretations, (eg Mervyn's view on the Elizabethan Settlement)?
- critique Sharp's view about the importance of the Independents to this debate
- place the narratives in the context of the time eg "Slingsby's attitudes were typical of many religious conservatives during Charles I's reign"
- unpack and critique Russell's "onion" metaphor
- 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.

Content possibilities (New Zealand in the Nineteenth Century):

The Scholarship candidate might:

- refer to the nature of the Waitangi Tribunal History, which sits somewhat at odds with the indigenous agency history presented by modern historians such as Belich, King, and Binney. These modern historians argue that the 'fatal impact' type of explanations are far too simplistic and that Māori to some extent were agents of their own change in the nineteenth century, choosing what aspects of Pākehā culture, ideas, and technology they wanted and adapting them to suit their purposes. They emphasise Māori resistance and acknowledge the complexities of nineteenth-century Māori society (eg kūpapa as well as Kingitanga). Yet the history of the Tribunal can at times be reminiscent of the sort of 'fatal impact' alluded to in the opening key idea. The Tribunal process has emphasised Māori grievance
- refer to the differing perspectives and attitudes of Māori and non-Māori historians
- 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 Sharp by referring to Binney)
- reference to James Belich's reputation as a 'crash starter' of debate in New Zealand historiography

- Refer to the attitudes of Pākehā contemporaries, who often viewed Māori and what was happening to them through a 'fatal impact' lens
- outline the changes that have occurred over time in relation to the representation of Māori in New Zealand history since the 1950s, including the Māori renaissance from the 1980s onwards.

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 or 7 marks)
- Make **informed** judgements about the nature of historical evidence and / or historical research. PD2 (6 or 5 marks)
- **Make valid judgements** about the nature of historical evidence and / or research. PD3 (4 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:

- Candidates who gain 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?
- Candidates who gain 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.
- Candidates who are 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). Candidates gaining 4 marks are likely to have made more of these sorts of low level judgements than candidates gaining 3 marks.
- Candidates who gain either 2 marks (at least one genuine attempt) or 1 mark (a glimmer!) must 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 1558–1667):

The Scholarship candidate might:

- comment on the need for more specific evidence from the source selection; eg the details of the Elizabethan settlement, statistics showing the number of Catholics, Puritans, etc
- discuss the nature of evidence; are these sources biased to show that religious uniformity would never occur?
- comment on the obvious bias and propaganda of Source H1 and Source H2, and place the cartoon in the context of similar images from the period rather than simply rejecting it because of its bias
- critique of the Spanish Marriage Treaty within the context of international relations
- place the extract from Slingsby's diary into its historical context, showing the candidate's knowledge of Slingsby and / or the events that he writes about
- analyse the contents of the items found in the inventory, commenting on its representativeness, usefulness and reliability.

Content possibilities (New Zealand in the Nineteenth Century):

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 the maps. What reasons other than war and confiscation led to Māori land loss? What was happening in the South Island? (possibly comment on the nature of Kemp's 'purchase')
- comment on the limitations of single pieces of evidence such as the Ngāti Apa extract (but also in the way in which the Ngāti Apa case study supports the generalisations made by Sharp and the land loss map)
- make a judgement about whether the evidence that has been the basis of the "dual agency" thesis which has come from the Hauraki region is applicable to other parts of the country; what were the specific features of Hauraki's race relations?
- comment on the limitations of the photo of Tawhiao's wharepuni and make a judgement about whether Kingitanga and Tawhiao's experiences were typical. The candidate might place the image within the context of the defeat of Kingitanga in the Waikato war and their subsequent exile
- analyse the whakapakoko, possibly commenting on Gilbert Mair's involvement; this is one single piece of evidence yet it seems typical of the way in which Māori responded to Christianity in the 1830s and 1840s.

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:

- 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*?

Scholarship 2005

Performance Summary For History

The individual skills in each descriptor have been each assigned a numerical value. The skills in Performance Descriptor 1 have been assigned a value of 8; in Performance Descriptor 2, a value of 6; in Performance Descriptor 3, a value of 4; and in Performance Descriptor 4, a value of 2. Where candidates are deemed to be an incremental step below these skill values, they can be awarded 7, 5, 3, or 1 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 marks**)
- **Skill 2:** develop informed and perceptive judgements about the nature of historical evidence and / or historical research (**8 marks**)
- **Skill 3:** critically evaluate historical narratives (**8 marks**)
- **Skill 4:** demonstrate a thorough and perceptive understanding of historical relationships in selected contexts and settings (**8 marks**)
- **Skill 5:** synthesise, with perception and insight, ideas relevant to the historical context(s) and setting(s) (**8 marks**)
- **Skill 6:** demonstrate an understanding of the critical underpinnings and scope of an historical question / context (**8 marks**)

Total: 48

Example Two

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

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

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 shown below.

Candidate #: _____

Option: *Tudor–Stuart England or Nineteenth-Century New Zealand*

<p>Argument (Skill #1)</p> <p><i>Respond to the view expressed in the key idea and communicate your own substantiated argument concerning the degree of religious uniformity in England between 1558 and 1667 / the impact of colonisation and Pākehā settlement on Māori, and Māori responses in the nineteenth century.</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)</p> <p><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)</p> <p><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 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 or 1) 	<p>Judgements about Evidence / Research (Skill #2)</p> <p><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)</p> <p><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)</p> <p><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)

Total score:

/ 48

Judgement Statement

An aggregate mark of 48 from six questions was used in History.

In 2005, candidates who achieved 38-48 marks were awarded outstanding scholarship and candidates who achieved 29-37 marks were awarded scholarship.