

## Assessment Schedule – 2012

### Scholarship: History (93403)

#### TOPIC ONE: England 1558–1667

#### ARGUMENT (SKILL No. 1)

A Scholarship candidate could discuss this topic in many different ways. In addition to addressing the extent to which 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. Respond to the statement in the task, which is explained in the key idea, and communicate your own substantiated argument **evaluating the significance of an historical study of early modern England 1558 – 1667. Candidates must demonstrate a broad, deep and balanced understanding of the topic, but may choose to focus on one aspect, or to look at the topic as a whole.**

- **Demonstrate an understanding** of the **critical underpinnings** and scope of an historical question/context to effectively communicate **sophisticated**, substantiated argument. PD1 (8 or 7 marks)
- **Understand and define** the scope of an historical question/context and **effectively** communicate **substantiated** argument. PD2 (6 or 5 marks)
- **Demonstrate some understanding** of the scope of an historical question/context and **communicate** an **argument**. PD3 (4 marks)
- **Attempt to demonstrate some understanding** of the scope of an historical question/context and **[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. The response to the issue has breadth, depth and balanced coverage.
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 **on the significance of an historical study of early modern England 1558 – 1667.**

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. The history of early modern England is significant because it is a study of important, interesting people, events and developments that provide the context for understanding society today – not just in Britain, but in the countries that she colonised.
2. The history of early modern England is significant, because it involves a study of religious change and its impact over the period. It provides the context for understanding the position that religion holds in society today. The question could be asked whether religious toleration / pluralism are modern concepts?
3. The history of early modern England is significant, because it is a study of the pursuit of power and the nature of leadership. It provides the context for understanding the British monarchy today and the institutions of power. It also makes us question what makes a good leader and this question is of relevance today.
4. The history of early modern England is important, because it allows us to investigate those who have been 'hidden' from history – women, those on the margins of society such as the poor, the sects. The significance of this period has changed since the development of social history and what Christopher Hill calls 'the worm's eye view' of the world. It is important to focus on ordinary people to try to understand what the people of times experience.
5. The history of early modern England is important, because it allows us to investigate key trends that resonate today – patriarchy; religious intolerance; class structure; popular beliefs.

6. The significance / relevance of an historical period has nothing to do with its proximity in time and place – it is significant in its own right **OR** this topic lacks significance, as relevance has everything to do with time and place and so the history of early modern England is less important than our own country's history.
7. The significance of history of early modern England can only be measured in a transnational context – when events, trends and developments are placed within the context of multiple kingdoms and / or Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It also matters because the legacy of events in this period is readily apparent in Ireland/Scotland today.
8. The significance of early modern England lies in its interesting historiography that forces us to address questions about the nature of history itself – can events be inevitable? Do people or forces precipitate events? The problem of hindsight? How do present-day perspectives colour our view of what happened in the past?
9. The history of early modern England is important in itself but it has been so distorted and romanticised by movies, television series and documentaries and novels that it is difficult to be balanced in our approach to it. All too often the focus of the period is on kings and queens and the glamour of the period, which gives us an incomplete picture.
10. The history of early modern England is significant, but to make parallels between that time and the present day is overly simplistic. 'The past is another country' that we can barely understand.

**Candidates should identify whether they believe that a study of early modern England is significant or important and state the extent of their position ie 'to some extent', 'to a great extent', 'to a limited extent'. They can look at a broad range of historical events, trends and developments across the years 1558 – 1667 or focus in depth on one or two.**

**Source A1 and A2** are brief extracts from articles about the importance of studying history outside New Zealand, or in the distant past. Bill Oliver was interviewed by Denis Welch about his career as a historian, and Oliver noted that his generation of historians had been 'trained' on history that 'happened elsewhere'. He argues that an historian of New Zealand history needs to have a good knowledge and understanding of the history of another society to be really able to look at New Zealand history in a dispassionate way. He also argues that studying history from outside provides us with greater depth of historical understanding. Candidates could use this source to argue that early modern England as a focus for historical study is significant for New Zealanders, that relevance / significance of historical study has little to do with proximity in time and place. Candidates could, however, question what Oliver means by the phrase 'the history of another society' – is he speaking of social history as well as political history? Dominic Sandbrook vents against a narrow focus on very recent history, particularly the Nazis, which he considers to be dangerous in today's world where we lack perspective and are arrogant about how technologically advanced we are. This source could be used to support the argument that the history of early modern England is thus significant and relevant to us today.

**Source B** summarises the views of historian Eric Ives on the relevance of studying the Tudors. He argues that much of popular history accentuates the romantic, exciting features of Tudor times but that this is a distortion of the reality. He also writes there are plenty of sources available to us which force us to ask new questions and open new areas of inquiry; that the extent of change that occurred made Tudor society exciting to live in and also to study. Candidates could use this source to support the argument that early modern England is significant in its own right. However, he argues that we should not make simplistic connections between the past and today – religion and the church, personal monarchy – how much connection is there really with the present day situation, he asks? Candidates could use this source to argue that the Tudors have been glamourised so much that their significance to us today has been lost. Or candidates could argue features of this age may look familiar to us, but in fact are very different – the present is nothing like the past – thus we should not make simplistic parallels so that historical study becomes insignificant or less significant.

**Source C** contains two sources that reflect on the leadership of Elizabeth. **Source C1** is a painting from 1590 entitled *An Allegory of the Tudor Succession*, by an unknown painter. It is a copy of Lucas de Heere's painting of 1572. It depicts a symbolic message (allegory) that Elizabeth is the legitimate heir to Henry VIII and has brought Protestantism, peace and prosperity to England, while Mary Tudor, with her foreign husband, Philip of Spain, and Catholicism, brought war. Henry is seen sitting on his throne in centre, with his son Edward beside him receiving the sword of justice. The date 1592 could be noted by candidates who could argue that the reality of her rule in 1590s was not reflected in this image. This was when the cult of Gloriana reached its heights in the last decades of the reign when Elizabethan England was threatened by rebellion in Ireland, war with Spain, harvest failures, deaths of trusted servants and other problems. Candidates could refer to the symbolism in the portrait. Candidates can refer to this source as a clear example of Gloriana, the government manipulation of the image of the queen as an object of devotion and veneration, as part of their argument that early modern England is a significant context to study the manipulation of power by monarchs such as Elizabeth 1, as some leaders do today. **Source C2** is an extract from the Golden Speech of Elizabeth to Parliament in 1601 on the issue of monopolies. She promised to repeal or suspend the most harmful patents. Candidates could use this source as an example of Elizabeth's rhetorical ability and her sense of responsibility as monarch and care for her subjects. Candidates could note that this is one version of the speech written down by a person who was present; it may not be entirely accurate.

Candidates could also discuss the fact that little was done about monopolies despite her words, which may suggest the failure of Elizabeth's leadership or that the speech was hardly compensation for the debacle over the monopolies. Candidates could use the fact that her governing class were moved by this speech, and her concern for their grievances counters the argument of some historians that her last years were entirely problematic, and set the scene for the difficulties that faced James and Charles. Candidates could also use these sources as part of a discussion assessing the relative merits of Elizabeth against the Stuart monarchs who followed her. **Source C3** provides a comparison of the two Queens named Elizabeth and places Elizabeth 1 in a modern context. Strong argues that there are clear parallels between the two Queens – both are 'great' and both fostered national unity through symbolism and ritual. Candidates could criticise this source for its overly romantic view of Elizabeth 1 (in a discussion about the significance of leaders / monarchs in this period) or could note how an historian can write about the past through a lens that is clearly influenced by contemporary people and events. Candidates could question if such parallels should be made or if Strong is showing his rose-coloured view of the value of the British monarchy.

**Source D** contains 3 sources that concern the Elizabethan Settlement. **Source D1** is a primary source of the front cover of the Book of Martyrs by John Foxe which candidates should recognise as a very influential book documenting the persecution of Protestants under Mary Tudor. The significance of this book was felt long after the period and help to explain the anti-Catholicism that has endured. This source depicts the Last Judgement, with Christ welcoming the saved into heaven, while the damned on his left go to hell. At the bottom right is depicted Roman Catholicism (on the side of the damned) while on the other side is the Protestant Church. The popularity of the book could be noted as it was reprinted a number of times and helped to popularise the belief of millenarianism. Candidates could use this source to argue that through studying early modern England we can understand how deeply embedded religion and the notion of a uniform church were. The text played a part in fostering anti-catholicism and a sense of England as a Protestant nation. The text remains part of English cultural identity today. They could also make links to the position of Islam in the Middle East or fundamentalism in the USA today. **Source D2** is an extract from The Book of Common Prayer. Candidates should recognise that the Elizabethan Settlement was clearly a Protestant settlement, but that compromise in the administering of Communion was formalised to pacify both Catholics and Protestants. Candidates could use this source to support an argument that early modern England provides a useful context for making comparative judgements about its monarchs – here Elizabeth was shown as skilful in establishing a Church that appeased most of her people or candidates could use it to argue that such a compromise satisfied few and left the way open for Catholic rebellion and godly demands for reform and considerable difficulties for the early Stuart kings. Candidates could also use this source to show that the Elizabethan Settlement established a Church that was a 'coalition' (A. N. Wilson in *The Elizabethans*) as to most citizens it showed the need to live and work together – a beginning to the 'consensus' politics of today.

**Source E** is an extract from revisionist historian Jenny Wormald on the importance of the seventeenth century British history. She argues that the century saw momentous events that caused enormous change and suggests that the historiographical debates are also important if not always easy to follow. Candidates could use this source to argue that the events of the civil wars within all three kingdoms, the execution of Charles I, the failure of the republic and the restoration of the monarchy are significant events in British history and helped shape Britain today. They could also argue that the nature of the historiographical debate is important as it highlights key historical questions such as whether events are inevitable; how important key figures are in precipitating events; whether forces are more important than people's actions in precipitating events. Candidates could alternatively argue that any century can be viewed as significant - there are transformative events in all centuries and important debates between historians about other eras and figures in history.

**Source F** concerns King James I. **Source F1** is an extract from revisionist historian S.J. Houston who argues that James I has been unfairly maligned in popular history as well as by other historians and some contemporaries. Candidates could argue that this period is important as it provides a useful context to judge the relative merits of its leaders / monarchs. **Source F2** is an extract from a recent article on the importance of the King James Bible. It puts its significance into the present day. Candidates could use this source to show the legacy of James I in today's world, or could use it to compare personal monarchs and thus show the importance of the period. Candidates could also argue that the King James version of the Bible may have had influence in the days of the British Empire but Nicholson has exaggerated its influence as those days are long gone and most people today do not find the meaning of 'humanity' within this Book.

**Source G** concerns the rule of Charles I. **Source G1** is an engraving showing Archbishop Laud as a 'papist threat', under the influence of Henrietta Maria and the Catholic Church, thus showing his Malignant Foolerie. **Source G2** is an extract taken from King Charles 1's Declaration prefixed to the Articles of Religion, November 1628. Charles had made clear his preference for the Arminian party over the godly clergy and his words in this extract defines Charles' insistence on a uniform church that all church personnel and religious teachers must adhere to. Candidates could use these sources to discuss the importance of religion and religious division in this period, which makes early modern England significant, and could contrast Charles' religious policies with those of James and Elizabeth.

**Source H1** is an extract from the Marxist historian Christopher Hill who argues that the 'real' history of Britain lies in the ordinary people who played such an important role in the time of the English Revolution. He argues that understanding the 'heroes' of the English Revolution will teach us lessons about tyranny, and how we can avoid it. He implies that the history that is all too commonly talked about is not the history of rebellion against leaders, but the history of those with power. For these reasons, this period of history is significant. Candidates could also argue that the period is rich in historiography – Hill talks about the era as the English Revolution but this has been disputed by other historians. The source could also be used to support the argument that as English history is often presented through its rulers its real significance is lost. **Source H2** is a woodcut showing the brutal punishment of the Quaker James Naylor. Candidates could argue that this woodcut clearly shows that no 'revolution' had in fact taken place as it is Parliament which decided on the punishment, despite Cromwell's reservations. Candidates could use this source to argue that the 1640s and 1650s were not significant in the way that Hill describes them; that religious intolerance continued with state direction. It could also be used to argue that despite such setbacks groups such as the Quakers are very much part of the religious setting today so real change did occur. The sources highlight the importance of balanced histories that represent the experiences of classes other than the governing class, those who have been 'hidden' from history until recently.

**Source I** provides evidence through two tables of statistics that the British Civil Wars had considerable impact on daily life although there was considerable regional variation. **Source I1** shows comparative deaths in the multiple kingdoms during the wars up to 1651; **Source I2** shows the costs of taxation of both parliamentary and royalist forces compared to the yearly charge of Ship Money over 4 counties. These sources could be used to argue that there were a variety of experiences during the civil war period which makes the period interesting to study. They could be used to identify the great cost of the wars, in particular on Ireland, and this remains a difficult legacy even today. Candidates could advance the argument that this historical topic is important as it provides us with knowledge and understanding of how Ireland, in particular, became a political and economic dependency of England and Northern Ireland remained so until the end of the twentieth century. **Source I3** is a map of the key battle sites of the civil wars from 1640 to 1651. It could be used to argue that this topic is significant because the civil war was experienced over the multiple kingdoms and the impact can be felt today. The map could be used to support Hill's view of the brutality of Cromwell in Ireland as well as supporting Kenyon's criticism of him and the statistics in table I1. The source could also support the more recent argument that the civil wars should be renamed the War/s of the Three Kingdoms.

**Source J** deals with King Charles' execution. **Source J1** is the frontispiece (the principal face or front) of the Eikon Basilike which probably was written by King Charles I and was designed to show him as a martyr king suffering at the hands of his enemies. Candidates could note that it shows the importance of the execution of the king as the first edition was published within a week of his death and within one year it had gone through 35 editions that kept the king's image alive in people's memory. The king helped to design the frontispiece. At the king's feet is the earthly crown but Charles is looking up at the celestial crown as he looks to heaven. This echoes what he said in his scaffold speech that he would go 'from a corruptible to an incorruptible crown where no disturbance can be'. Charles is holding a crown of thorns, linking his death to that of Christ. There are a number of symbols in the engraving that signify Charles' strength and commitment to the cause – the rock in the stormy sea and a palm tree that does not topple despite the weights tied to it. **Source J2** is an etching of the execution of the King that betrays its bias as it suggests again that Charles I was a martyr. It reinforces the statement from a commentator (perhaps Philip Henry, that as the axe fell, there was 'such a groan as I never had heard before, and desire I may never hear again.' After Charles' execution, some of the crowd rushed forward to dip their handkerchiefs in his blood or to collect handfuls of earth from below the scaffold. Candidates could use this source to show the significance of the period because of the extraordinary events and the strange ways people reacted at the time. **Source J3** is an extract from the speech that the King gave on the scaffold. He reasserted his right to rule without the advice of his subjects and stated that subjects could never exercise freedom without a king. Candidates could argue that this shows the stubborn, inflexible approach to ruling for which Charles has been criticised, in contrast to the more conciliatory approach of James and Elizabeth. **Source J4** is an extract from Geoffrey Robertson's book centring on the figure of John Cooke who was the prosecutor at Charles' trial. He challenges historians' accounts of the trial and argues that it was fair and just in comparison to those of John Cooke and the other regicides. This source supports the arguments of Hill that the events 1641 – 60 were memorable and 'crucible years' and so candidates could use this approach.

**Source K1** is a portrait of Cromwell that is a mirror image of a portrait of Charles that suggests that the Lord Protector was indistinguishable from a monarch by 1655 – 56. In combination with **Source K2**, which is very critical of Cromwell, it adds weight to the argument that the leaders of the era were not straight forward people but contradictory and interesting in their own right but the sources contradict Hill's view that this was a revolutionary period. **Source K3** is an anti-Commonwealth engraving that drives home the point that the Commonwealth (the dragon) has enslaved the ordinary people and has destroyed their rights. According to the source, Cromwell remained in power with the military backing of the standing army of about 60,000, thus suggesting that this period saw no genuine revolution on behalf of the people.

**Source L1 and L2** are primary sources demonstrating another important event in early modern England, the Restoration. **Source L1** is a diary entry from John Evelyn, a strong Royalist sympathiser during the Republic who

describes the Restoration as a time of general rejoicing. **Source L2** is an extract from the Declaration of Breda that shows the appeasing promises made by the astute Charles II to the public - that there would be a free and general pardon of Republicans (except for the named regicides), that parliament would resolve the problem of confiscated estates and that there would be 'liberty to tender consciences'. Candidates could use these primary sources to highlight that the Restoration, like other key events over the period, do not provide straight forward answers about why it came about and thus this is an interesting period to study. Candidates could also use the source to discuss whether attitudes towards religious toleration had changed over the period and that the questions about religious developments are important in understanding religion today.

**Source M1** and **M2** are both primary sources that illustrate that entrenched customs and festivals remained constant over the period, indeed are of relevance today. The engraving *The Vindication of Christmas* by John Taylor is but one example of protests against the abolition of Christmas under the Republic. **Source M2** is a painting from the end of the period (1670) that shows the value placed on social hierarchy, the noblesse oblige of the governing class and the deference of the governed class. It shows that despite the dramatic upheavals of the 1640s and 1650s that this value continued and was considered vital in an ordered society. Behind this ritual/custom lay an emphasis on the importance of community and neighbourliness – while Sir Tichborne was giving charity, he was also emphasising the social difference between him and his neighbours and kin and his superior status. Students could use this source to argue that the period allows us to study key trends / popular festivals that resonate today – or that, despite the upheavals of the civil war and the republic, there was a great deal of continuity in peoples' lives. But students could also argue that the painting was created deliberately to stress these values by those who were in power and who worried that their place in the world was being undermined.

**Source N1** and **N2** are about the position of women in early modern England. **N1** is by historian Anne Lawrence who is at the forefront of women's history and who writes about the importance of women in history who for too long have been 'hidden'. She argues that this is partly due to prejudice about women but also because for a long time history has not been written about ordinary people but about 'glorious' leaders. Candidates could argue that studying early modern England today allows us to develop an insight into this society and to view women not simply in relation to men but as demonstrating agency. Post-revisionist historians could be referred to further develop this argument. **Source N2** shows the labour of women in the governing class. It is an extract from Lady Hoby's diary that could be used to illustrate that the patriarchal ideal was challenged in practice. Lady Hoby frequently discussed business affairs with her husband, shared decisions with him and demonstrated a strong bond of mutual respect between her and her husband. She also wrote about a wide range of tasks she undertook in which she helped run the estate. Her devotion and piety and her participation in theological discussions are also noted. Candidates could discuss the dominance of the trend of patriarchy and what essential differences there were in the lives 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.

#### HISTORICAL RELATIONSHIPS (SKILL No. 4)

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

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

#### **Explanatory notes**

1. A candidate who gains 7 or 8 marks for this skill should provide an insightful and perceptive integration of historical relationships. This could be explicit or implicit.
2. A candidate who gains 6 or 5 marks is likely to have brought in plenty of accurate and relevant detail to demonstrate their understanding of the historical relationship. This could be explicit or implicit.
3. A candidate gaining either 4 marks or 3 marks is likely to have included the historical relationships but may not have included supporting evidence. This could be explicit or implicit.
4. A candidate gaining either 1 or 2 marks is likely to have attempted to include the historical relationships. This could be explicit or implicit.

**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.

- **Continuity and change:** in the present day, popular beliefs have not entirely disappeared and in some ways are undergoing a revival – how can this phenomenon be linked to the past?
- **Continuity and change:** to what extent did trends such as patriarchy remain constant over the period?
- **Continuity and change:** was Elizabeth's reign much more successful than the monarchs that followed her; how far did Elizabeth rely on the foundation of previous monarchs to rule England successfully? How well did she deal with the problems facing England in 1558 and how many problems did she bequeath to James in 1603?
- **Continuity and change:** was there an English Revolution in the mid 17<sup>th</sup> century? If not, were there lasting changes arising out of the Civil Wars and the Interregnum?
- **Specific – General:** the significance of one persons' experience (Lady Hoby's diary) as representative of other women in the governing class; the significance of evidence about particular areas (eg Scotland, Ireland and England) in discerning the extent to which events there created crisis. Also the significance of one person's views (Engravings against Laudianism) as to how representative they were of widespread resentment at the Arminian Church
- **Cause and effect:** cause and effect: what was the legacy of Elizabeth for James and Charles? Did her reign set the scene for a growing conflict between the crown and its governing class, leading to civil war in 1642?
- **Cause and effect:** to what extent was Charles led 'astray' – or was he the director of events leading to civil war? The significance of one man in history over forces
- **Cause and effect:** how far was Arminian a challenge to the Church of England? How far was religious discord a cause of civil war?
- **Cause and effect:** there were other fundamental areas of conflict between Charles and parliament – Charles' conception of his role of king and his inflexibility; his opposition's demands to reform the church, control Charles' collection of finance outside parliament and control his ministers – which factors were most important in precipitating war?
- **Cause and effect:** civil wars were a British phenomenon – what impact did events in Scotland and Ireland have on bringing on civil war? When can we say that the civil wars ended?
- **Cause and effect:** what impact did Cromwell's godly reformation have on England? Was there a reformation of manners?
- **Patterns and trends:** how different was Elizabeth's rule to other monarchs of the period?
- **Patterns and trends:** was the legacy of Elizabeth and James such that Charles was forced to take unpopular directions to 'make ends meet.' Was the archaic state a 'failed state' before Charles?
- **Past and Present:** the legacy of English rule in Ireland – how important is knowing the history of English colonisation for understanding its legacy?
- **Past and Present:** how do present-day historians view Elizabeth, James, Charles I and Cromwell? How much do events in the present-day influence how historians view them as leaders? Do we today have a different notion of leadership than in the past?
- **Past and Present:** do historians today view Elizabeth differently because there has been so much concern for equal rights / for gender rights compared to past historians who may belittle Elizabeth's achievements because she was a woman? Can we make comparisons between Elizabeth I and Elizabeth II?
- **Past and Present:** how much should historians today use psychological descriptions to judge people in the past?
- **Past and Present:** 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. Are social historians guilty of presentism? Most recently, a number of historians have made in depth studies of domestic life – do these really help us to know what life was like? Students could discuss these issues in their argument
- **Past Present:** is learning about early modern England a 'corrective to arrogant present mindedness'?
- **Past and Present:** England has a monarch today who is head of the Church of England; the law and parliament are still intact – what links are there between today and these institutions of 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries?
- **Past and Present:** are there parallels to be made between modern leaders such as Pinochet and Milosevic and Charles I?

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

### SYNTHESIS OF IDEAS (SKILL No. 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 should provide 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 and effectively into 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)**

For the type of ideas that a candidate might draw from the sources to incorporate into their argument, see content possibilities for argument (skill No. 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 resources.

### EVALUATING HISTORICAL NARRATIVES (SKILL No. 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 will have used the historians' arguments or made at least one genuine attempt to evaluate narratives or 1 mark has attempted to use the historians' arguments or has attempted to make an evaluative comment about the views of historians and /or contemporaries concerning the historical issue (a glimmer!).

### **Content possibilities (England)**

The Scholarship candidate might:

- Comment on Bill Oliver's assertion that New Zealand historians need also to study the history of other societies so they can understand the present day world
- Comment on Sandbrook's point that it is vital, in today's constantly changing world, we need to develop perspective by learning about the 'real' past
- Comment on the emergence of social history and the study of women, sects and other groups that had limited power
- Comment on Eric Ives warnings that we should not make parallels between the present and past as these were simplistic
- Recognise that Sir Roy Strong is a strong supporter of the monarchy and that his views on Elizabeth I are highly complimentary in contrast to other historians (not in the sources) who are very critical
- Recognise Sir John Neale as an historian who wrote in the middle of the twentieth century at a time when England faced great danger from invasion as did England in 1588 and in 1590s; and his views of Elizabethan England facing the religious conflict between Catholicism and Protestantism reflects the ideological conflict of the Cold War. Recognise too that his views have been discredited by Norman Jones and Christopher Haigh and others who argue that Elizabeth I did not face pressure from a puritan choir in the commons but from Catholics in the Lords
- Recognise S.J. Houston as a revisionist historian, who has debunked the negative image of James I given by contemporaries such as Sir Anthony Weldon and later historians and argues that it was his father, not him, failed to deal adequately with problems before the civil war
- Contrast Christopher Hill's views on the significance of the 17<sup>th</sup> century with those of Jenny Wormald. Christopher Hill is a Marxist historian who was the first to investigate those without power
- Comment on Geoffrey Robertson's legal perspective on an historical event – is he writing a history book or making a legal statement? Was Charles I a villain? A tyrant like Pinochet of Chile and Milosevic of Serbia in recent times? Comment on the presentism here?
- Recognise that modern historians are as divided as earlier ones on Cromwell's legacy – J. P. Kenyon being only one example given
- Refer to Evelyn's contemporary narrative that gives a glowing account of the Restoration and analyse why this might have been, and how representative this would have been
- Refer to Anne Laurence, a revisionist historian, on women in early modern England, who argues that history of the period lacks significance unless it takes into account women and other groups lacking power and uses the rich sources available to historians such as the diary of Lady Hoby
- Refer to the many historians whose arguments are missing from the sources, but could be referred to by candidates.

Note that when citing historians' views, candidates need to link those view(s) to their argument.

### **JUDGEMENTS ABOUT EVIDENCE / RESEARCH (SKILL No. 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 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!) must have attempted to make a judgement about the sources 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 on causes of the civil war – reference to Ireland, Scotland and England could be made; on diversity of religious experiences; on differences between the lives of the social orders
- Discuss the nature of evidence. For example:
- Source D1– how Foxe's book did a great deal to cement a certain view of that contested past of Protestant martyrs into English national consciousness. Students could comment how the frontispiece and the book itself emphasized how the martyrs' lives and deaths conformed to that of Christ. The different editions of the book included changes that resonated with people at that time. It is difficult to know which edition is the 'true Foxe' in one sense as it was a collaborative exercise with his printer, John Day.
  - What is the purpose of images such as C1, sources K1 and M2. How do such images work? Recognise the important symbolism in such portraits and comment on the limitations of such portraits / paintings?
  - What was the purpose behind source L1 (Evelyn's commentary on Charles II entry into London)?
  - In what ways were Sources G1, K3 and M1 satirical? Who might have been the intended audience?
  - What statistics are missing in the tables I1 and I2? How might the data have been collected in these sources?
- Comment on the representativeness, usefulness and reliability of these sources as evidence and the limitations of some of these sources relative to others:
  - Comment on the bias of socialist historians such as Christopher Hill
  - Comment on the reliability of the statistics in I1 and I2
  - Comment on the representativeness of the personal account in the diary entry in source N2
  - Comment on the usefulness of the engravings D1, H2, J1 and J2
  - Comment on the need for more information about the causes of the civil war, on religious division, on popular beliefs, on the reformation
  - Comment on the need for feminist historians on Elizabeth 1 and on women's history.

## TOPIC TWO: New Zealand in the Nineteenth Century

### ARGUMENT (SKILL No. 1)

A Scholarship candidate could discuss this topic in many different ways. In addition to addressing the extent to which they agree or disagree with the notion, it is important that candidates add their own knowledge so that coverage is broad, deep and balanced. This question covers an extended period of time and has 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. Respond to the statement in the task, which is explained in the key idea, and communicate your own substantiated argument **evaluating the significance of an historical study of New Zealand 1800-1900**. Candidates may choose ONE aspect of the topic or may choose to look at the topic as a whole. Candidates must demonstrate a broad, deep and balanced understanding of this historical issue through their argument

- **Demonstrate an understanding of the critical underpinnings** and scope of an historical question/context to effectively communicate sophisticated, substantiated argument. PD1 (8 or 7 marks)
- **Understand and define** the scope of an historical question/context and **effectively** communicate **substantiated** argument. PD2 (6 or 5 marks)
- **Demonstrate some understanding** of the scope of an historical question/context and **communicate** an argument. PD3 (4 marks)
- **Attempt to demonstrate some understanding** of the scope of an historical question/context and [**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. The response to the issue has breadth, depth and balanced coverage.
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 (New Zealand)

Scholarship candidates will be able to advance clearly, fluently and logically their own **arguments on the significance of an historical study of New Zealand 1800-1900**.

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. Nineteenth century New Zealand history is important because it is a study of significant people, events and developments that provide the context for understanding New Zealand society today.
2. Nineteenth century New Zealand history is important because it is a study of the events, attitudes and political policies that contributed to current race-relations issues in New Zealand. It provides the context for understanding the position of Māori in New Zealand society today.
3. It is not significant because it is not exceptional. New Zealand history is too short and the events, trends, developments have not been particularly remarkable.
4. New Zealand history is important to New Zealand identity but the significance of it is lost due to the fact that the historiography of nineteenth century New Zealand 1800 –1900 does not represent the complete nineteenth century experience ie gender, region, class and race experience adequately.
5. New Zealand history is important to New Zealand identity but the significance of it is lost due to the fact that the historiography of nineteenth century New Zealand 1800 –1900 is primarily Pākehā-centred, therefore it is an incomplete history. A bi-cultural history would be significant.
6. The significance of any history can only really be measured in its transnational context, ie when the trends and developments are put in the context of global trends and developments in the nineteenth century.

Candidates should identify whether they believe that a study of nineteenth century New Zealand is significant and state the extent of their position, ie “to some extent”, “to a great extent”, “to a limited extent”. They should identify whether they will cover one aspect of the topic or the topic as a whole but in either case must look at a broad range of historical events, trends and developments across the nineteenth century.

**Sources A1 and A2** summarise the views of revisionist historians Judith Binney and Michael King on the importance of Māori history. Binney writes that there are two versions of colonisation in nineteenth century history, that of Māori and Pākehā and that the Māori version of history has been suppressed by the dominance of the

written form of history which is the Pākehā form over the oral form (which is Māori). Binney argues this meant the Pākehā version of colonisation has become the accepted version. Candidates could use this source to argue that nineteenth century New Zealand history is not significant because the accepted version is not representative of the Māori experience. They could add that should the Māori voice be heard on the colonisation experience, then the history would be balanced – and therefore significant. King argues that it is especially important for good Māori history to be heard, because it is part of the Treaty claims process. It could be used to argue that New Zealand history is important because of the significant role that the Treaty plays in today's society and because it provides the context for understanding the position of Māori in New Zealand society today. It could be used to support the argument that as Māori history is not always presented accurately its significance is lost.

**Source B** summarises the view of historian Jock Phillips on the contribution of history to the developing New Zealand national identity. He argues it is important for good history to be written by historians, because too much is written poorly by non-historians, such as television production companies. He writes that the cult of popular history has trivialised our history and that it is important for professional historians to take responsibility for writing our history to adequately define our national identity. Candidates could use this source to support the argument that Nineteenth century New Zealand history is important because it is a study of the people, events and developments that provide the context for understanding New Zealand society today. Candidates could also use this source to argue that nineteenth century New Zealand history isn't significant as a means by which to define our identity because professional historians have inadequately responded to society's expectation that they write nationalist histories.

**Source C1** by Māori historian Ranginui Walker argues that despite the trauma of colonisation and the assimilation policies of successive Pākehā governments after the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi Māori were resilient, and eventually a cultural renaissance occurred. He also argues that the work of the Waitangi Tribunal in redressing some of injustices of the nineteenth century helped New Zealand to construct a sense of nationhood. **Source C2** is a photograph of a group of Nga Puhi who were arrested for protesting against the imposition of the Dog Tax in 1898. These sources could be used to support the argument that nineteenth century New Zealand history is important as it provides the context for understanding the position of Māori in New Zealand society today. The map in Source E could be used in support of Walker's comments about the trauma of colonisation in Source C1, and in relation to the resilience show by Māori in Source C2. The source could also be used to support the argument of Binney and King in Sources A1 and A2 and Byrnes in H1 that the voice of minorities such as Māori is important to any good history of nineteenth century New Zealand. If used in this way it supports the argument that New Zealand history is insignificant because it is imbalanced in its representation of Māori. The source highlights the importance of the study of the Treaty of Waitangi.

**Sources D1 and D2** outline the views of Belich on Māori resilience in the nineteenth century. He denounces the 'fatal impact' theory of orthodox historians arguing that Māori were not a dying and crippled race. He also argues that assimilation and marginalisation did not crush Māori. It could be used to argue that our history is important, because important events took place here – such as the confiscation of Māori land in the second half of the century, and because of the impact the events had on Māori people since that time period. Sources D1 and D2 could also be used to argue that the Māori experience was misrepresented by Pākehā historians.

**Source E** is a map of the alienation of Māori land in the North and Chatham Island in the 1860s and 1880s. It could be used to argue that our history is very important because important events took place here such as the confiscation of Māori land in the second half of the century, and because of the impact the events have had on Māori people since that time period. The map could be used in support of Walker's comments about the trauma of colonisation in Source C1 and in relation to the resilience shown by Māori in **Source C2**. The source could also be used to support the argument of Binney and King in Sources A1 and A2, and Byrne in H1 – the voice of minorities such as Māori is crucial to any good history of nineteenth century New Zealand. If used in this way it supports the argument that New Zealand history is insignificant because it is imbalanced in its representation of Māori. The source highlights the importance of the study of the Treaty of Waitangi.

**Sources F1 and F2** are primary sources demonstrating the experiences Māori had of the Native Land Court after 1865. They could be used to argue that our history is very important because important events took place here such as the confiscation of Māori land in the second half of the century and because of the impact the events have had on Māori people since that time period. They could be used in support of Walker's comments about the trauma of colonisation in Source C1, and in relation to the resilience show by Māori in Source C2. The source could also be used to support the argument of Binney and King in Sources A1 and A2 and Byrne in H1 that the voice of minorities such as Māori is very important to any good history of nineteenth century New Zealand. If used in this way, it supports the argument that New Zealand history is insignificant because it is imbalanced in its representation of Māori. The source highlights the importance of the study of the Treaty of Waitangi.

**Source G** provides the view of a Māori historian of the significance of the Treaty of Waitangi in a modern context. Mikaere argues that Waitangi Day should be more revered in New Zealand and should reflect our pride in being

New Zealanders. It could be used to argue that nineteenth century New Zealand history is important because it is a study of significant people, events and developments that provide the context for understanding New Zealand society today, and that it provides the context for understanding the position of Māori in New Zealand society today. However, it could also be argued that revisionist historians are, as Olssen writes guilty of presentism in that the significance of the Treaty of Waitangi in today's context has caused historians to read more into the meaning of the Treaty that was actually signed in 1840.

**Sources H1 and H2** outline the views of Byrnes and Belich on the problems with New Zealand history. Byrnes argues that New Zealand's written history does not take into the account the diversity of historical experiences, paying too little attention to plurality and difference. This source could be used to argue that New Zealand history is important to New Zealand identity but the significance of it is lost, because the historiography of nineteenth century New Zealand (1800 – 1900) does not represent the complete nineteenth century experience (ie gender, region, class and race experience) adequately. Belich argues that there are two problems with New Zealand history. Firstly, not enough important research is being done. Secondly, the perception is that New Zealand history is too boring to bother writing about. This source could be used to argue that nineteenth century New Zealand history is not significant, because it is not exceptional. New Zealand history is too short and the events, trends, developments have not been particularly remarkable. Belich disagrees that New Zealand history is boring. He writes that all the great themes of history played out in New Zealand in the nineteenth century. This could be compared and contrasted with Fairburn's view – that our history is not exceptional.

**Source I** by historian Miles Fairburn suggests that very few historians of New Zealand's history write about the exceptionalism of our history because our history is not exceptional. He argues that while multitudinous events that happened here did not happen anywhere else but they in themselves do not indicate that New Zealand's history was exceptional, ie our history is not unique. This source could be used to argue that nineteenth century New Zealand history is not significant, it is too short and the events, trends, developments have not been particularly remarkable.

**Source J1** is a painting of a beach scene in New Zealand, with a sailing ship near the shore, surrounded by rowing boats. Settlers on shore, either arriving or departing, one with a pick for gold-mining, others with baggage, many waving at the ship, other groups in the background rushing to greet the arrival or departure. It could be used to argue that as nineteenth century New Zealand history tells the story of the migrants who came here it is an important history of the development of our national identity. The fact that the painting could depict migrants leaving New Zealand suggests that migrants were not happy with the conditions in nineteenth century New Zealand. This lends itself to the argument that individual stories – such as those of the migrants who left New Zealand in large numbers in the 1870s and 1880s – and other minority groups have not been recorded in history therefore an important part of our national identity has been lost, therefore the significance of our history is lost in the inadequate way in which it has been told. The migration statistics in **Source J2** support these ideas.

**Source K1** puts forward the argument that New Zealand did experience a depression between 1870 and 1890.

**Source K2** provides evidence of the causes of poverty or the reasons why people applied for charitable aid between 1896 and 1900. These sources could be used to argue that there was a variety of experience in nineteenth century New Zealand history making our history varied and interesting. They could be used to identify the fact that the depression led to significant social and political change, which contributed to New Zealand's identity as a social laboratory that was the envy of the rest of the world. This could also be used to argue that such policies played a significant role in shaping New Zealand identity and therefore make the study of our history significant. The sources highlight the importance of balanced histories that represent the experiences of different classes, genders, regions etc which could be used to argue that New Zealand's history has not fairly represented diversity as Byrnes suggests in Source H1. Alternatively, it could be argued that as these events are not put in the transnational context they are insignificant.

**Source L1** summarises the view of Phillips that frontier conditions and isolation forced men in nineteenth century New Zealand into a close comradeship or 'mateship'. This could also be used to highlight the exceptionalism of the nineteenth century New Zealand experience and its relevance to our identity today. Alternatively, it could be argued that as these events are not put in the transnational context they are insignificant. **Source L2** is a no-alcohol pledge card designed and used by the WCTU to encourage abstinence amongst nineteenth century New Zealand men. In combination with L1 it adds weight to the argument that New Zealand nineteenth century history was diverse, interesting and perhaps exceptional yet as Byrnes said it is necessary to be mindful how effectively the diversity of experiences has been recorded by historians.

**Sources M1 and M2** are cartoons from the 1890s depicting the contribution that women in the nineteenth century made to significant political, social and economic change in New Zealand. Source M1 demonstrates the battle that women waged to attain political emancipation, ie she has climbed to 'parliamentary heights'. Source M2 depicts the campaign the WCTU led against poor working conditions in factories towards the end of the century. These cartoons could be used to support the argument that nineteenth century New Zealand history is significant because

significant events took place here by the end of the century, ie the idea that New Zealand was a social laboratory for policy that the rest of the world envied. It could also be used to argue that, despite the short length of time of our history, great events took place – making our history worthy of study.

**Source N1** by orthodox historian Cowan provides a positive account of the legislation passed during by the Liberal Party at the end of the nineteenth century and of Richard Seddon as Premier. He writes that legislation such as women's suffrage, old age pensions and advances to settlers attracted a great amount of attention in the outside world. He refers to such reforms as 'experimental socialism'. The contemporary cartoon in Source N2 suggests that by enfranchising women, Seddon had given power to women, ie 'a new hand at the wheel'. These sources support the argument that nineteenth century New Zealand history is important, because it is a study of significant people, events and developments that provide the context for understanding New Zealand society today. They could also be used to highlight the exceptionalism of the nineteenth century New Zealand experience. Alternatively, it could be argued that, as these events are not put in the transnational context, they are insignificant.

## HISTORICAL RELATIONSHIPS (SKILL No. 4)

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

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

### **Explanatory notes**

1. A candidate who gains 7 or 8 marks for this skill should provide an insightful and perceptive integration of historical relationships. This could be explicit or implicit.
2. A candidate who gains 6 or 5 marks is likely to have brought in plenty of accurate and relevant detail to demonstrate their understanding of the historical relationship. This could be explicit or implicit.
3. A candidate gaining either 4 marks or 3 marks is likely to have included the historical relationships but may not have included supporting evidence. This could be explicit or implicit.
4. A candidate gaining either 1 or 2 marks is likely to have attempted to include the historical relationships. This could be explicit or implicit.

### **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 patterns and trends.

- **Cause and effect** – the desire of Pākehā to assert their sovereignty over Māori after the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi and the use of war and law to achieve this aim as well as the assimilation policies
- **Cause and effect** – the desire of Pākehā migrants to own land and the attitudes that settlers brought with them about land ownership clashed violently with the attitude that Māori had towards land. This led to the wars that began in the 1860s
- **Cause and effect** – Pākehā attempts to assert their sovereignty over Māori led to Māori marginalisation but also their resilience
- **Cause and effect** – the recession of the 1880s led to social policy that led to government intervention and the development of social policy by the Liberal Party, ie social laboratory, and God's own country idealism
- **Continuity and change** – many migrants to New Zealand dreamed of owning their own land. This remained a constant aspiration throughout the century
- **Continuity and change** – unlike Britain, many migrants hoped that New Zealand would be egalitarian, a place where it was easy to get ahead, a workers' paradise, the land of milk and honey
- **Continuity and change** – most settlers came to New Zealand seeking the political independence that they did not have in the old world, ie New Zealand would be the brave new world
- **Continuity and change** – did the determination of New Zealanders to succeed in the new world lead them to surmise that New Zealand was God's own country by 1900
- **Continuity and change** – the different physical, cultural, social and economic environments in different regions led to the differing experiences of migrants and the emergence of diversity
- **Past and present** – Pākehā attempts to assert their sovereignty over Māori led to Māori marginalisation in the past – but in the present, as Ranginui Walker argues, this has led to a cultural renaissance
- **Past and present** – conflicting understandings of the meaning of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 led to race relations issues and to the Waitangi Tribunal

- **Past and present** – the Liberal Party policies of the nineteenth century led to New Zealand's acceptance of a welfare state in the modern context
- **Past and present** – are social historians guilty of presentism? Do they impose current views of social policy on nineteenth century experiences?
- **Past and present** – if present day campaigning for equal rights has influenced the writing of historians on the nineteenth-century experience of the suffragists etc
- **Patterns and trends** – Miles Fairburn sees the desire of Pākehā settlers to get ahead in New Zealand as contributing to an “atomised” New Zealand that lacked strong community bonds
- **Patterns and trends** – did the values, fears and beliefs of migrants change nineteenth century New Zealand?
- **Specific and general** – can experiences such as the suffrage campaign and other Liberal Party policy, the Treaty of Waitangi and our race relations policies and our cultural development really be seen as exceptional or should it be seen in the context of global developments.

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

### SYNTHESIS OF IDEAS (SKILL No. 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 should provide 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 and effectively into 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 (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 No. 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 resources.

## EVALUATING HISTORICAL NARRATIVES (SKILL No. 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 will have used the historians' arguments or made at least one genuine attempt to evaluate narratives or 1 mark has attempted to use the historians' arguments or has attempted to make an evaluative comment about the views of historians and/or contemporaries concerning the historical issue (a glimmer!)

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

The Scholarship candidate might:

- Refer to the argument of Binney in Source A1 and comment on the fact that very little history has been written from the Māori viewpoint
- Comment on King's statement in Source A2 about good history in light of the criticism of King as a proponent of the general history genre and the lack of depth in his own historical research
- Comment on the argument of Phillips in Source B that history plays a role in national identity and the need for professional historians to write more New Zealand history
- Contrast the views of Belich in Source D1 and D2 with those of Walker in Source C1 and Mikaere in G. Note that Walker and Mikaere are Māori historians with a Māori view which could be considered to be biased
- Recognise that James Cowan is an orthodox historian and that his views have been revised by historians such as Sinclair, Dalziel and more recently by Nolan and Ballantyne
- Recognise the context in which Mikaere is writing in Source M. This is not history
- Comment on the need to contrast Phillip's views that New Zealand was a 'man's country' in Source L1 with those of Fairburn on atomization, and to contrast Fairburn's view with the view of Daley that a sense of community was strong in nineteenth century New Zealand
- Comment on the need to contrast the view of Sutch in Source K1 with the views of Hawke that it was a recession only
- Comment on the need for Belich to provide evidence on his argument in Source H2 that the quality of New Zealand history is variable and that historians regard the subject matter as dull. Comment on the need for Byrnes in Source H1 to provide evidence to support her statement that New Zealand history does not account for diversity of experience
- Comment on the emergence of and the significance of the exceptionalism, presentism and transnationalism arguments in very recent years. Comment on James Belich's recolonisation and transnational argument and the focus of the New Oxford on transnationalism
- Comment on Fairburn's argument in Source I that the events of nineteenth century New Zealand were not unique and therefore not significant
- Recognise the lack of comparison of New Zealand with global developments at the same time in the writing of New Zealand history
- 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
- Recognise the view of Russell Stone that New Zealand was an underdeveloped country and Vogel's Plan was a significant development. W J Gardner and Dalziel agree

- Introduce William Pember Reeves' argument that Vogel was the beginning of state socialism which led New Zealand to become interventionist, an egalitarian democracy
- Refer to the argument of Pember Reeves that Liberal Party policy made New Zealand the social laboratory of the world and that Australia and the US looked to New Zealand as a model. Recognise his bias as a former Liberal Party member
- Comment on the fact that Keith Sinclair and David Hamer agree that the Liberals completed the democratization of the State
- Comment on the significance of the positive migratory experience as argued by historians such as Fairburn, Arnold, Phillips and Olssen. Consider the conflicting arguments of Fairburn on atomisation and social isolation and Arnold's argument on New Zealand as a rural arcadia. Contrast this with Phillips' argument on male isolation and the emergence of mateship and Olssen's argument of class identity
- Refer to the need to consider class experience, eg Eric Olssen and Stevan Eldred-Grigg
- Question Keith Sinclair's argument that New Zealanders outgrew their colonial beginnings and achieved national identity and independence. Candidates might suggest this is presentism
- Contrast 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 nor was it only the result of their achievements in their role as wives and mothers in the new colony as argued by Raewyn Dalziel
- 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.

Note that when citing historians' views, candidates need to link those view(s) to their argument.

## JUDGEMENTS ABOUT EVIDENCE / RESEARCH (SKILL No. 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 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!) must have attempted to make a judgement about the sources as they address the historical issue.

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

The Scholarship candidate might:

- Comment on the need for more specific evidence from the source selection on diversity of experience including information tribal, regional, gender and class experiences
- Discuss the nature of evidence eg:
  - Why was the photo taken in Source C2 and F1? What were the circumstances surrounding these photographs? What statistics are missing in the graphs in Sources D3, J2, K2 and N2? How was the data collected in these sources?
  - Why were the cartoons drawn in Sources M and N2? What was the purpose of the cartoonist? Where was it published?
  - What was the exact purpose of the pledge in Source L2? Where did it appear? How was it used?
  - How was the data on the alienation of Māori land in Source E collated?



- Comment on the representativeness, usefulness and reliability of these sources as evidence:
  - What comments can be made on the limitations of a single piece of evidence in Sources E and G
  - Comment on the bias of Māori historians such as Walker and Mikaere
  - Comment on the reliability of statistics in the graphs in Sources D3, J2, K2 and N2
  - Comment on the representativeness of the personal account in the diary entry in Source F2
  - Comment on the usefulness of the photographs in C2 and F1
- Comment on the need for more information about the experiences of migrants to New Zealand and the lack of sources on migrants' perspectives
- Comment on time period in which Binney, Belich and Phillips are writing about the writing of New Zealand history. Have there been any developments since they wrote these articles?
- Comment on the need for sources from nationalist historians such as Sinclair and feminist historians such as McDonald
- Comment on the date of Walker's article on the Waitangi Tribunal, and the need to consult a more up to date source on the success of the Tribunal.

**NEW ZEALAND SCHOLARSHIP 2012**  
**PERFORMANCE SUMMARY FOR HISTORY – TOPIC ONE OR TOPIC TWO**

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; an example is outlined below.

**Example one:**

A candidate demonstrating the following skills all from Performance Descriptor 1:

- **Skill 1:** demonstrate an understanding of the critical underpinnings and scope of an historical question / context through effectively communicated 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.

**Total: 40 (Performance Category 1)**

**Example two:**

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

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

**Total: 28 (Performance Category 3)**

Candidate No.: \_\_\_\_\_ Option: *England or New Zealand*

<p><b>Argument (Skill No. 1)</b> Demonstrate an understanding of this historical issue through breadth, depth, and balanced coverage by responding to the view expressed in the key idea and communicating your own substantiated argument.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate an understanding of the critical underpinnings and scope of an historical question/ context through effectively communicating sophisticated, substantiated argument. PD1 (8 or 7)</li> <li>• Demonstrate an understanding and define the scope of an historical question/ context through effectively communicating substantiated argument. PD2 (6 or 5)</li> <li>• Demonstrate some understanding of the scope of an historical question/ context through communicating an argument. PD3 (4)</li> <li>• Attempt to demonstrate some understanding of the scope of an historical question/ context by attempting to communicate an argument. PD4 (2)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Evaluating Historical Narratives (Skill No. 3)</b> Evaluate historians' interpretations and the views of contemporaries that relate to this historical issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critically evaluate historical narratives (sustained). PD1 (8)</li> <li>• Critically evaluate historical narratives. PD2 (6)</li> <li>• Evaluate historical narratives. PD3 (4 or 3)</li> <li>• Attempt to evaluate historical narratives. PD4 (2 or 1)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Historical Relationships (Skill No. 4)</b> 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate a thorough and perceptive understanding of historical relationships in selected contexts and settings. PD1 (8 or 7)</li> <li>• Demonstrate an informed understanding of historical relationships in selected contexts and settings. PD2 (6 or 5)</li> <li>• Demonstrate an understanding of historical relationships in selected contexts and settings. PD3 (4)</li> <li>• Attempt to demonstrate an understanding of historical relationships in selected contexts and settings. PD4 (2 or 1)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Judgements about Evidence/Research (Skill No. 2)</b> Make judgements about the nature of historical evidence concerning this historical issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop informed and perceptive judgements about the nature of historical evidence and/or historical research. PD1 (8 or 7)</li> <li>• Make informed judgements about the nature of historical evidence and/or historical research. PD2 (6 or 5)</li> <li>• Make valid judgements about the nature of historical evidence and/or research. PD3 (4 or 3)</li> <li>• Attempt to make valid judgements about the nature of historical evidence and/or research. PD4 (2 or 1)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Synthesis of Ideas (Skill No. 5)</b> Integrate relevant ideas about this historical issue from the evidence in the sources and your own knowledge to develop your argument.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Synthesise, with perception and insight, ideas relevant to the historical context(s) and setting(s). PD1 (8 or 7)</li> <li>• Synthesise ideas relevant to the historical context(s) and setting(s). PD2 (6 or 5)</li> <li>• Identify ideas relevant to the historical contexts and settings. PD3 (4 or 3)</li> <li>• Attempt to identify ideas relevant to the historical contexts and settings. PD4 (2 or 1)</li> </ul>	

Total score: /40