

## Assessment Schedule – 2008

### Scholarship: History (93403)

#### ARGUMENT (SKILL #1)

Respond to the view expressed in the key idea and communicate your own substantiated argument concerning **the extent to which the patriarchal ideal remained a constant factor governing society in early modern England / the extent to which the enfranchisement of New Zealand women by the end of the nineteenth century demonstrates that New Zealand was an exemplary paradise.**

- 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* (8 or 7 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)

Scholarship candidates will be able to advance clearly, fluently and logically their own arguments about the extent to which the **patriarchal ideal remained a constant factor governing society in early modern England.**

Candidates are likely to show in their opening paragraph an argument that establishes their position in relation to the extent of change/continuity in family life/gender roles AND/OR the extent of harshness and brutality / affection and romantic love in early modern England. There are several possibilities:

1. That the patriarchal ideal remained constant and that women's role and status were in reality as inferior as they were legally and theoretically.
2. That the patriarchal ideal did not match the reality of family life and gender roles across the social orders. Notable exceptions to the dominance of patriarchy in all spheres of family life can be found in the making of marriages, in relations between parents and children and between husbands and wives. Women's agency could be stressed. This includes the ability of women to control their own life evident in culture, ritual, language, trade etc.
3. That the challenges to the patriarchal norms in the 1640s and 1650s by some women and radical sects represented a distinct break from previous years, despite the status quo being re-established with the Restoration, and that the seeds of women's emancipation can be seen in this period. Examples of women's agency could be outlined.
4. That the challenges to the patriarchal norms in the 1640s and 1650s by some women and radical sects were so firmly squashed by the state and church and the desire to return to past social order so strong among the people that there was no change to the dominance of patriarchy. Some might argue that women's status and power deteriorated by the end of the seventeenth century (eg in economic terms) but this would entail discussion of ideas beyond the dates of this course.
5. That family life did indeed become more 'modern', in that affection in families, romantic marriages became common by the end of the period.
6. That romantic love and affection was a feature of family life since the Middle Ages – continuity is stressed. Harsh, brutal patriarchy is a myth in the early modern period.

Candidates should give some idea of what they understand by 'patriarchy'. They should also state their position in relation to the continuum (the extent – some, a great deal, not much etc).

Source A1 is a short explanation of the nature of patriarchy and shows the influence of the Bible in maintaining this ideal. It mentions sermons and conduct books as a means of transmitting values – students could discuss the likely impact of these on a population who largely could not read. A2 is connected in that it is an extract from William Whately's *A Bride Bush*, a sermon later published in book form. It could be used to argue that the mere presence of

such a book/sermon suggests that the power/duties of husbands and wives were perhaps subject to some debate; that there was a crisis in gender relationships, as David Underwood has suggested OR it could be used to support the argument that patriarchy was all-pervasive.

Source B shows how patriarchy was accepted by Lady Anne Clifford (a woman who had indeed challenged the ideal of the 'silent' woman with her campaign to get back her property) in the portrait that she commissioned by emphasising the importance of her brothers in her family lineage. It does not show a non-acceptance of patriarchy, but students could use details in the portrait about Lady Anne that illustrate her 'difference' from other women.

Source C is another example of a conduct book from a Puritan minister and was one of the most influential ways of outlining the respective duties of husbands and wives. An extract from the first edition is given along with an amendment in the third edition that suggests that Gouge is responding to concerns from his parishioners in regard to the status and role of wives. It is clear in this source that patriarchy was not synonymous with oppression. There is moderation of the patriarchal ideal in this source, which students should note. Students should pose the questions as to why conduct books were so popular; what was the connection between the rise of Protestantism, married clergy and these books? How did they follow the teachings of St Paul / St Peter / the story of the Fall on the subjection of wives to husbands? How was Gouge's idea of the wife as 'joint governor with her husband' connected to the wife's subordination to him? How much impact did such books have on an illiterate population?

Source D is an extract from Lawrence Stone's book *The Family and Marriage in England 1500–1800*. It is the orthodox historiographical position, stating that the short duration of marriages and high infant mortality weakened relations between family members who were consequently inhibited from making close emotional ties with spouses or children; marriages were made for practical considerations and usually arranged by parents, rather than for love and by the couples themselves; relations between husbands and wives and parents and children were cool and harsh. This would support the argument that by the end of the seventeenth century there was a change in family relationships towards the growth of love and affection as a major bond in the family.

Source E contains two extracts from revisionist historians, Keith Wrightson and Ralph Houlbrooke, who challenge the assumptions of Stone by emphasising the quality of marital relationships over this period. These extracts could support the argument that there was continuity in the family / gender relationships, that we should not accept the patriarchal ideal at face value as practice did not follow precept. Both argue moderate positions; the more extreme argument about the continuity of romantic attachment is not presented here but could be discussed by candidates as well.

Source F is a woodcut illustrating the expectation that women in the middling and lower orders in rural England worked in partnership with their husbands in such activities as shearing sheep and milking; that women had a full role in the family economy; that perhaps a significant sexual division of labour did not take place until after the end of the early modern period. Women's agency could be argued / or it could be argued that a sexual division of labour did exist and it was 'efficient and inequitable. It depended on the obedience of the woman to the man, as Eve to Adam. Men decided what they would do and left the rest to women.'

Source G shows the labour of women in the governing class. G1 is an extract from Lady Hoby's diary and could be used to illustrate that she frequently discussed business affairs with her husband / that decision making was shared / that there was a strong bond of mutual respect between husband and wife / the wide range of tasks that Lady Hoby had in helping to run the estate / her devotion and piety and also her participation in theological discussions. This along with G2, which is the cover page of a book on the role of the Housewife in the middling and elite orders supports the argument that the patriarchal ideal was challenged in practice. Candidates could discuss what essential differences there were in the expected labour of women from the different orders. They could discuss the ways the lives of the most privileged women resembled those in the lower orders more than they resembled the lives of men.

Source H shows a woodcut of a skimmington and extracts from the Mayor's Court of Norwich – the ritual of the skimmington was used to enforce communal conformity to accepted standards of sexual morality and to the ideal of women as 'chaste, silent and obedient'. The court documents also show that drunken women or those who were considered too raucous or had committed sexual impropriety could find themselves facing legal sanctions. The sexual double standard is obvious in these extracts and could be used to show the power of patriarchy.

Source I contains two tables from the casebook of Richard Napier who was an astrological physician and who carefully recorded the reasons for his clients' visits. Candidates should recognise that clients came to him because of emotional / familial issues, which could be used to argue that relations in the family were warmer, closer and more equal than the orthodox position allows, or that people's emotional lives were important to them.

Source J is an extract from the Leveller Women's Petition 1649 that challenges the conventional role assigned to women as 'the weaker vessel' and could be used to discuss how much the English revolution 'turned the world upside down'. Students could use the extract as a starting point to discuss the impact of the Civil War on gender

roles and family life and to question whether indeed there was lasting change for women. Reference to Antonia Fraser's arguments in *The Weaker Vessel* would be relevant here.

Source K is a graph that illustrates the increase in publications by women from the 1640s and thus shows how women joined in the general religious and political debates that were generated by the disputes between King and Parliament. Candidates could use this to illustrate women's agency but should also note the sparse number of books before the middle of the seventeenth century, which shows indirectly the low level of female literacy in England.

Source L is an extract from a post-revisionist viewpoint on women's social position and argues that historians need to look more closely at women's culture as opposed to simply looking at the private and public roles of women (which evaluates their roles in relation to men's) or examining the differences in the lives of women from the different social orders.

### **Content Possibilities (New Zealand)**

Scholarship candidates will be able to advance clearly, fluently and logically their own arguments about the extent to which **the enfranchisement of New Zealand women by the end of the nineteenth century demonstrates that New Zealand was an exemplary paradise.**

Candidates are likely to show in their opening paragraph an argument that establishes their position in relation to this idea. There are several possibilities:

1. That women were emancipated through enfranchisement and this reflected the progressive ideas of democracy, equality, egalitarianism, and liberalism in New Zealand. The enfranchisement of women was a part of the idea that New Zealand was a social laboratory and therefore an exemplary paradise.
2. That women were enfranchised because of the effort of the suffragists not because New Zealand was a progressive society, ie the feminist argument of Grimshaw. They were socially, politically and economically emancipated to a limited extent due to the efforts of groups like the WCTU and the Tailoresses Union, and to a lesser extent to those of progressive politicians, and therefore New Zealand was an exemplary paradise to a limited extent.
3. That women were given the vote as an extension of their role as wife and mother and therefore this does not reflect a progressive nineteenth-century New Zealand society, ie Dalziel. Women were given rights such as the Married Women's Property Act, the right to an education, labour laws etc as a social and political reward for their efforts in the colony. Not emancipation as such. This supports the Pember Reeves idea that women were given the vote as a consequence of their fight for temperance.
4. That women were eventually politically emancipated in 1893, but economically, legally and socially they were inferior for much of the century, enfranchisement in 1893 does not reflect the experience of women over the whole century. The Contagious Diseases Act, Māori Land Rights, Married Women's Property Act etc demonstrate a society that had not freed itself from old world evils.
5. There were numerous social issues in nineteenth-century New Zealand society such as poverty and racism and the need for and eventual passing of legislation to deal with these issues at the end of the century demonstrates that New Zealand was not a liberated society and people were not emancipated, ie Chinese, Maori, Women and the poor. Therefore the vote is not a representation of the experience of women over the century, ie Charlotte Macdonald.
6. Women were emancipated but other groups in society such as the working class, Māori and the Chinese were not and / or it was an exemplary paradise for some but not for others.

Candidates should give some idea of what they understand by 'exemplary paradise'. They should discuss the idea of colonists' aspirations and also state their position on New Zealand as an exemplary paradise (the extent – some, a great deal, not much etc).

Source A is an extract from the 1860 Married Women's Property Act. It shows that the experiences of women in nineteenth-century New Zealand were at times difficult. It also demonstrates the presence of old world evils in New Zealand in that women were deserted by their husbands in times of need. It demonstrates the state's commitment to the protection of women and supports Dalziel's 'colonial helpmeet' argument, ie that women deserved certain rights. It could also be used to argue that the experience of women varied greatly over the decade and it could be used to support or refute the idea that New Zealand was an exemplary paradise.

Source B explains that inequality was a common experience in nineteenth-century New Zealand, it introduces the issue of racism and encourages the candidate to consider race inferiority as well as gender inferiority. It encourages the candidate to construct an argument beyond gender, or at least to construct a comparative argument. Despite legislation that might have appeared to emancipate women and Māori (eg the Married Women's Property Act and the Māori Representation Act) inferiority was experienced by these groups for much of the century.

Source C shows that Māori women had their own social issues. Māori women were active in the fight to have the Land Court abolished and to protect Māori land. The source could be used to support the argument that New Zealand was not an exemplary paradise for Māori.

Source D1 outlines the argument of feminist historian Patricia Grimshaw. Grimshaw argues that enfranchisement in New Zealand can be attributed to the hard work of the WCTU and Kate Sheppard. She acknowledges the presence of a feminist movement in New Zealand. She also acknowledges the contribution of a liberal, progressive government. This source could be used to support the argument that women were emancipated due to the work of the feminist movement, it could also be used to argue that New Zealand was politically and socially progressive. D2 shows the effect that the WCTU had on the passing of the 1893 franchise bill. Active campaigning in areas where unions were strong influenced the amount of signatures on the petitions. This demonstrates the politicisation of women as opposed to the idea that they sought the vote as an extension of their role. It could be used to show that New Zealand was a paradise in the sense that colonists could agitate for change.

Source E explains the attitude to the poor in New Zealand throughout the nineteenth century. This could be used to support the argument that New Zealand was not the land of plenty nor was it an exemplary paradise. It also demonstrates that while women may have been emancipated politically they were not emancipated socially or economically.

Source F supports the argument that New Zealand women were politicised, it demonstrates the argument that women agitated for the vote and were emancipated. It also could be used to support the colonial helpmeet argument: that women were emancipated as a reward for their efforts in the colony. The ideas are radical for 1869 and demonstrate the aspirations the colonists had for political progression in the new world.

Source G1 demonstrates the fact that there was a gender imbalance throughout the nineteenth century. Candidates can use this information to support the colonial helpmeet argument: that women were valued due to the scarcity and that this was extended to their enfranchisement in 1893, hence they were politically emancipated. The Fairburn ideas could be used to argue that New Zealand was not an exemplary paradise. It encourages candidates to consider the experience of men and compare their experiences with women's. G2 shows men outside a hotel in Hokitika, it supports the man alone idea.

Source H1 is a summary of the colonial helpmeet argument of Dalziel: that women were given the vote as an extension of their role as wife, mother, homemaker and guardian of society's morals. It could be used to support the argument that they did not agitate for the vote. Candidates could use it to argue that women were enfranchised but they were not socially emancipated and that New Zealand was not progressive and therefore not an exemplary paradise. Source H2 is a contemporary account that supports the colonial helpmeet argument.

Source I exemplifies the social laboratory idea of the Liberal era. The significant number of changes made to benefit the lower classes suggests that for much of the century New Zealand was not emancipated, but was by 1900. It could be used to argue that New Zealand became an exemplary paradise by the end of the century. It emphasises the aspirations of colonists.

Source J demonstrates the battle that women waged to attain political emancipation. The woman is being 'helped up' by the male politician demonstrating the exemplary paradise idea. It could also be used to argue that while women had been given the vote they still had a long way to go to achieving 'perfect political equality' ie political representation.

Source K1 contains statistics on convictions under the Contagious Diseases Act. Candidates could use this information to support the argument that there was no one common experience for women in the nineteenth century and that women were not socially emancipated for much of the century. Source K2 supports this idea and also contributes to the argument that women agitated for change, ie the tailoresses union in this instance. This could be used to argue that women fought for and won change as opposed to the idea that change was made by progressive politicians. It also demonstrates that New Zealand was not an exemplary paradise in the latter half of the century.

Source L shows what a significant occasion the vote was for women in 1893. The formal way in which the colonists have dressed contributes to the sense of occasion and the idea that political emancipation was valued by the colonists.

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 a strong argument based on the original key idea. In a sense they are a strong stimulus to thinking about possible arguments. The sources should be organised by the candidates to enable them to make connections.

**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 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 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:

- The significance of evidence from particular regions (eg Source H – Norfolk) to generalise about rituals in the rest of England. Also the significance of one person's experience (Lady Hoby's diary) as representative of other women in the governing class; the significance of individual women who showed 'courage beyond their sex'.
- Continuity and change in the nature of family life / gender roles. Was there a change as suggested by Lawrence Stone; or was romantic love a feature of English family life since the Middle Ages and thus also in the early modern period. Candidates should demonstrate their knowledge of the role women played in the Civil War and discuss whether their activities in this period represented a real break with the past.
- The present-day concern for equal rights has influenced the way historians have written about women / historians today are much more interested in social history, in writing about those 'hidden' from history. Candidates could discuss these issues in their argument.
- If indeed there was continuity OR change in family life, what causes lie behind this trend? – the rise of Protestantism; economic change; the English Revolution; the rise in literacy; population increase and the growth of towns, etc.

Candidates are not expected to cover all these aspects but should be able to build an argument around some of these ideas.

**Content possibilities (New Zealand)**

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:

- The gender imbalance provided women with a fulcrum from which they were able to extract an advantage.
- The abundance of men had a roughening effect on New Zealand society, culture and on the men themselves.
- The aspirations of settlers for an improved quality of life in New Zealand led to expectations of political, legal and economic emancipation.
- The economic status of women determined their social experience, ie working class women experienced desertion, drunken husbands etc.
- The changing experience for Māori women after colonisation.
- The present-day concern for equal rights has influenced the writing of historians on the nineteenth-century experience.
- If indeed the experiences of women and other New Zealanders did change due to legislation such as the 1893 vote for women.

**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 or 5 marks is likely to have brought in plenty of accurate and relevant detail from their own knowledge and integrated this appropriately in to their argument.
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 into 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 New Zealand)**

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.

Candidates who blend the sources selectively within their own ideas will be rewarded. They should not merely paraphrase the sources.

The scope for this should also factor the number of sources that they access in relation to those ideas, argument and evidence that they bring from their own knowledge. They are required to use a minimum of seven.

### **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 7 or 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 either 5 or 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 *evaluated 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 candidate 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 on and discuss the different historians' interpretations about the nature of family life and the influence of patriarchy on familial relationships; students should know the basic ideas behind Stone, Wrightson, Houlbrooke.

- Comment on the post-revisionist views of Sara Mendelson and Patricia Crawford in their discussion of the power of women's culture and the importance of the agency of women in this period. They argue that women worked together in shared spaces, tasks and conversation, thus developing a consciousness of themselves as a sex. While most did not challenge patriarchal power, the bonds that developed between women and female-only / directed activities could potentially be subversive – women were not feminists in the modern sense of the word but their consciousness of themselves as women is significant beyond the petitions, demonstrations and religious / political activism of the 1640s and 1650s. Candidates might bring in the concept of presentism in their discussion of these historians.
- Recognise the weaknesses in the arguments of Stone, but also recognise that his work was a pioneering one in social history. Students should be able to recognise why 'revisionist' ideas have emerged and connect their discussion to the changing methodology of historians.
- Mention the contrasting views of other historians' views as part of their arguments, eg Alan MacFarlane, David Underwood, Antonia Fraser.
- Place the narratives of the contemporaries in the context of the time – eg Lady Hoby, William Gouge and William Whately and the influence of Puritanism; Leveller women's petition – what exactly were they asking for?
- Include discussion of views of contemporaries / narratives not referred to in the sources – such as Ralph Josselin's diary, Samuel Pepys, Lucy Hutchinson, Brilliana Harley, Aphra Behn, Moll Cutpurse, Bess of Hardwick and many others in relation to their argument.
- Be prepared to challenge sources that do not sit well with evidence that the candidate brings into the examination.

Note that when citing historians' views candidates need to link that view to their argument about the extent to which the patriarchal ideal remained a constant factor governing family life in early modern England.

### **Content possibilities (New Zealand)**

The Scholarship candidate might:

- Refer to the feminist perspective of Patricia Grimshaw and Sandra Coney that the concession of the vote was the outcome of a woman's movement and not simply a consequence of progressive politicians. Coney and Grimshaw believe that society became more radical after the Depression of the 1880s and that change was fought for, rather than gifted by the Liberal government. Candidates should know the basic argument of Grimshaw, recognise the weakness of Grimshaw's argument that her work was written in the height of the feminist movement of the 1970s and is perhaps influenced by this.
- Refer to the orthodox argument of Raewyn Dalziel that women were enfranchised because of their achievements in their role as wives and mothers in the new colony and that they campaigned for the vote to safeguard the morals of society and therefore as an extension of their role. Dalziel also supports the argument that New Zealand society had a special character, ie the social laboratory idea. Candidates should know the basic argument of Dalziel.
- Refer to the revisionist view of Charlotte Macdonald – that there was no colonial helpmeet ideal, that women had a variety of experiences.
- Refer to the arguments of Grimshaw, Macdonald, Daley and Ballara – that the fact that women are poorly represented in New Zealand history limits our understanding of their experience.
- Refer to the argument of Pember Reeves that New Zealand was a social laboratory during the government of the Liberals. Recognise his bias.
- Refer to the argument of James Belich that progress and prosperity were myths of New Zealand settlement and that Pākehā colonists believed that legislative change demonstrated that New Zealand was an exemplary paradise.

### **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 about regional variations; female monarchs in the period; the differences between the world of men and the world of women; childhood; parents and children; marriage making; women in the sects; recusant women; specific examples of women from the Civil War; pictures of homes/artifacts from domestic life.
- Discuss the nature of evidence. For example, Sources A and C – specific comments about the nature of conduct books – who read these? Was the message in them disseminated widely or only to a very small literate population? What sort of people wrote them and why? Does their existence support the argument that patriarchy was being challenged? Sources F, G and H are woodcuts – how reliable are these for an historian since they lack authors / dates / other specific aspects about their origin? What purpose did they have – to present an ideal (a form of propaganda or a view of reality). Source B – a portrait – how useful / limited is it in telling us about the lives of people at that time? Source G – Lady Hoby’s diary – how representative is it? Source I – tables of statistics from Richard Napier – what statistics are missing that might add to the picture he gives us? Source K – graph of women’s publications – how far is this evidence of a challenge to patriarchy? What kinds of publications were included in the statistics? How does it compare to the number of publications by men over the same period?
- Comment on the lack of sources covering key issues such as economic developments that would have had considerable impact on family life / sexual division of labour; wills.
- Evaluate court records from Norwich (Source H) suggest that scolds, drunken women and women who had sexual relations outside of marriage were likely to be punished. Was this typical of other regions? How limited is the picture that official records such as this give us? The image of the skimmington could be evaluated as to whether this was a scene that was replicated frequently / in towns as well as villages / what was the role of the neighbourhood women in this particular image? Candidates must be able to draw on their own knowledge of the period and not just rely on the given.
- Comment on the representativeness, usefulness and reliability of these sources as evidence. The limitations of some of these sources relative to others. What comment on the limitations of single pieces of evidence can be made about the tables of statistics of Richard Napier? Lady Hoby’s diary? The Leveller’s Women Petition?

### **Content possibilities (New Zealand)**

The Scholarship candidate might:

- Comment on the need for more specific evidence from the source selection including sex ratios that include regional variations, the occupations of women taking class and region into consideration marriage rates, regional variations in the Contagious Diseases arrests, contemporary accounts of the effect of the Married Woman’s Property Act, desertion statistics.
- Discuss the nature of evidence. For example: What is the purpose of Mary Muller’s Pamphlet in Source F? Comment on the obvious bias of the Liberal’s leaflet. Why was the photo in G1 taken? How representative is the photo in Source L of how many women voted in the first election? How representative is Grace Hirst’s experience? What is the purpose of the cartoon in Source J? What statistics are missing in Source K1 and D2?
- Comment on the need for more information about the nature of the photographs.
- Comment on the lack of sources covering male perspectives and political debates over the enfranchisement of women, contemporary accounts of male, Chinese, Māori experiences.
- Comment on the representativeness, usefulness and reliability of these sources as evidence. What comments on the limitations of a single piece of evidence can be made about the petition statistics and Muller’s pamphlet, the photos.



## UNDERSTANDING OF QUESTION / CONTEXT (SKILL #6)

<i>Demonstrate an understanding of this historical issue through <b>breadth, depth, and balanced</b> 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)

### **Content possibilities (England and New Zealand)**

A Scholarship candidate could discuss this topic in many different ways. In addition to addressing the extent that they agree or disagree with the notion, it is important that candidates add their own knowledge so that coverage is broad, deep and balanced. These are both questions that cover an extended period of time and have allowed for candidates to keep that in mind when constructing their argument – how much weight they give to one argument at a point in time compared with its relevance at a later point.

### **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*?

## NEW ZEALAND SCHOLARSHIP 2008

### 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 (Performance Category 1)**

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 (Performance Category 3)**

Candidate #: \_\_\_\_\_ Option: *England or New Zealand***Argument (Skill #1)**

*Respond to the view expressed in the key idea and communicate your own substantiated argument concerning the extent to which the patriarchal ideal remained a constant factor governing society in early modern England / the emancipation of New Zealand Women by the end of the century demonstrates that New Zealand was an exemplary paradise.*

- 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)

**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)
- critically evaluate historical narratives. PD2 (6)
- evaluate historical narratives. PD3 (4 or 3)
- attempt to evaluate historical narratives. PD4 (2 or 1)

**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)
- 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 or 1)

**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)
- 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)

**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)
- 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)

**Understanding of question/context (Skill #6)**

*Demonstrate an understanding of this historical issue through breadth, depth, and balanced coverage.*

- 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