

Assessment Schedule – 2007

Scholarship: History (93403)

England 1558–1667

Skill #1 Argument

Respond to the view expressed in the key idea and communicate your own substantiated argument concerning **the extent to which England experienced a revolution during the period 1603–1660**.

- 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 could agree or disagree with the premise that the period 1603 to 1660 was a period of revolution. Candidates should define the concept of revolution or at the very least discuss what they understand by the term. They could discuss whether this was a time of change rather than of revolution. The expectation would be that the candidate should discuss the extent to which the changes during this period could be defined as revolution. While their argument can be constructed around the notion of revolution, candidates at this level should have an understanding of the historiography of this period and discuss the various different stances such as contemporary views, Marxist, revisionist and post-revisionist. Scholarship candidates must be able to name other modern historians who have argued against the traditionalists and Marxists: Coward, Graves, Cressey, etc.

Scholarship candidates could argue the revisionist point of view: there may have been considerable change during the period, but this did not amount to a revolution as the changes were not long lasting. Candidates could begin with reference to the tensions evident at the end of Elizabeth's reign but most would start with a discussion of the conflicts under James I. While the Gunpowder Plot against James I was an attempt to challenge authority, it could not be argued that it was part of a revolution. This is an opportunity for candidates to construct their argument about the extent of revolution in the timeframe. Most arguments would start with Charles I in 1628, which gives scope for candidates to adopt a position in relation to the extent to which there was a revolution over the whole period, or just one part of it. Charles' conflicts with Parliament leading to the Civil War could be seen as the beginning of revolutionary change. The execution of Charles and the period of the Interregnum could also be seen as revolution.

The resources in this question booklet should be used as stimulus, not as definitive sources on which to base an argument. The sources are intentionally very eclectic. Candidates however should be able to look at the sources and use them to refute or support their argument. Candidates should attempt to discuss the ideas but do not need to agree with any or all of the sources. Candidates must use their own knowledge to support their discussion.

Source A discusses Hill's idea of revolution of thought, an intellectual revolution. Even if the Puritan revolution was defeated nothing could stop the changes that had occurred in thinking during this period. Although Christopher Hill argues that there was revolution in every aspect of life, candidates do not need to include all aspects (religious, intellectual, political, social, economic). Candidates could discuss the sects and new political ideas that emerged in the Civil War and Interregnum which were not completely suppressed during the Restoration period.

Sources B, C and D give varying opinions on the Gentry controversy. Candidates could use these to discuss social and economic changes. Some may know that Tawney was a socialist historian who started out as a Marxist but went against the traditional views of Trevor-Roper and the extreme Marxist views of Hill. Candidates will not be penalised for the failure to discuss this particular historical debate but could use these to discuss social and

economic change in general – wasn't revolution but did it help foster rebellion and revolution. A scholarship candidate could put forward ideas of economic change and development bringing social and political change.

Source E gives the revisionist view of social change in the 17th century. Graves & Silcock argue that social mobility was a personal not a class experience. This could be used to refute the argument about the rise and fall of classes leading to revolution.

A Scholarship candidate could use Source F to discuss the rebellious attempt of Guy Fawkes to destroy the governing classes. Candidates could also discuss other rebellions and uprisings that occurred. An interesting argument could begin with this source as it gives an opportunity to discuss the differences between rebellion and revolution.

Source G shows changes in agricultural earnings. A candidate could use this to look at economic changes that had taken place in Tudor Stuart England. They could discuss agricultural improvements. There is the obvious rise in prices up to 1640, then the years of the Civil War and Interregnum show steep decline in wool and grain prices compared with stock prices. These rises and falls could hardly be used to support the notion of an agricultural revolution but this instability could lead to a revolutionary situation. Candidates could ask how revolutionary were these economic changes.

Source H should help candidates discuss the changes that took place in agriculture during this period. Candidates should be able to discuss some of the trends that were happening such as the development of a dual economy where workers were employed on the land and in industry. Candidates should be able to describe innovations that took place in some areas such as the draining of the Fen Lands. It gives scope for them to interpret revolution in a broader context.

Source I is from the trial of Charles I. This gives candidates the opportunity to discuss the act of regicide which can be described as a revolution. Parliament was ridding itself of what it saw as a tyrannical master. The passage also has Charles rebelling against the legality of the court. Candidates could use the source to discuss the nature of the trial and the reasons for it and its consequences. They need to discuss the extent to which it was a revolutionary action.

Source J shows further acts of revolution. This could give candidates an opportunity to discuss Cromwell as a revolutionary figure and the extent to which the Interregnum brought on a revolution. Under the leadership of Cromwell not only has Charles been killed but everything that he stood for is being removed from England. In the trees are the Bible, the Magna Carta, Statutes, The Eikon Basilike and the Law Reports. This is a Royalist etching which does portray Cromwell as a revolutionary stripping away the fundamentals of society. Cromwell is using the Bible to justify his position.

Source K shows a royalist point of view, but it will give candidates the chance to discuss the end of the Interregnum and the re-establishment of the monarchy. Candidates could discuss the role of Monk in the return of Charles II. It also allows candidates to discuss the role of the Rump and other experiments in government. Candidates might refer to the revolution turning in on itself (the modern view of 'revolution' ie the wheel turning full circle.)

Source L is Samuel Pepys' diary entry for May 2 describing people's reaction to Charles' return. It suggests that the Restoration was hugely popular and allows candidates to discuss the nature of the Restoration Settlement including the Act of Oblivion and the Declaration of Breda. Candidates could also discuss the Clarendon Code even though it is beyond the time frame of the question.

The sources are not intended as a chronological coverage of the key ideas about the revolution. 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. There should be a strong argument which could argue that:

- England was in a period of change not necessarily revolution, and at times groups of people were given to rebellion as a means of getting change.
- England did undergo a revolution as the regicide and the republican experiments fundamentally changed England.
- England underwent a religious/political/economic/social revolution – that is candidates could successfully argue that there was a revolution in one element for one part of the time period and qualify it for other parts. This should involve a discussion of causes.
- Candidates can reject the notion of revolution in all respects – that the restoration represented little fundamental change between Personal Monarchy up to 1640 and the situation facing Charles II in 1660.

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 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 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, particularly in the period 1603 to 1660:

- Social mobility – changes and continuity
- Religious changes
- The economic situation – extent of changes
- Impact of Civil War
- The trial and execution of Charles
- Cromwell and the Republic
- Restoration of Charles II

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 #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 in to 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 NZ)

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 judgements in order to gain a mark of 4 (or have fewer but stronger evaluative points)
4. A candidate who gains either 2 marks (at least one genuine attempt) or 1 mark (a glimmer!) has to have attempted to make an evaluative comment about the views of historians and/or contemporaries concerning the historical issue.

Content possibilities (England)

The Scholarship candidate might:

- comment on different historians' interpretations – eg, Marxist, revisionist, post-revisionist, contemporary views
- comment on the reasons for changing viewpoints and how this is reflected in the 'names' given to this period of history – eg. Great Rebellion, Puritan Revolution, War of Three Kingdoms, The English Revolution
- place the narratives in the context of the time
- comment on differing viewpoints of contemporaries and the reasons they held them eg Lucy Hutchison, Clarendon, Richard Baxter, John Evelyn, Samuel Pepys

Note that when citing historians' views, candidates need to link that argument to their argument about the extent of revolutionary change in the period.

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 a source selection – eg Source G – shows the general pattern of economic rises and falls but it does not allow for local variation / it covers a wide time frame so thus lacks validity
- discuss the nature of evidence; are these sources biased to show the Royalist propaganda against Parliament; the fear of many about the Puritan’s motives. For example, specific comments about obvious bias within Sources J and K and how they are examples of propaganda is required. Most candidates should be aware of other sources that show bias such as images of Cromwell showing him as the saviour of the nation who has trampled the wicked king.
- comment on the lack of sources covering key issues in discussion of whether there was a revolution or not – eg religious issues, the problems of Charles I and his weaknesses, the Civil War and its impact
- comment on the representativeness, usefulness and reliability of these sources as evidence.

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 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 in the Nineteenth Century

Skill #1 Argument

Respond to the view expressed in the key idea and communicate your own substantiated argument concerning **the extent to which the Treaty of Waitangi played a pivotal role in the development of New Zealand's sense of nationhood by 1900.**

- 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

5. Candidates whose arguments are *sophisticated* (8 or 7 marks) could have demonstrated this through literacy, fluency, insight, elegance, flair, discernment, complexity and/or originality.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. A candidate who is awarded 2 marks has made an attempt to communicate an argument or has written a competent accurate narrative.

Content Possibilities (NZ)

Scholarship candidates will be able to advance clearly, fluently and logically their own arguments about the extent that the Treaty of Waitangi played a pivotal role in the development of New Zealand's sense of nationhood by 1900.

Candidates should give some idea of what they understand by a 'developing sense of nationhood'. They should also state their position in relation to the continuum (the extent – some, a great deal, not much, etc). 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 it was the Treaty that established the notion of nationhood in 1840 and the idea developed from there. This is an unlikely argument.
2. That it was other instruments that developed New Zealand's sense of nationhood – particularly since the Treaty was increasingly ignored and Māori as Treaty partners became increasingly marginalised during the century. Any sense of nationhood was increasingly a Pākehā one.
3. That New Zealand's sense of nationhood was not developed or only marginally developed by 1900. The Treaty played little part in that development.
4. That New Zealand had by 1900 several contrasting senses of nationhood depending on whether they were living in a rural or urban environment, or whether they were members of one or other Māori iwi, or Pākehā, or North Islander or South Islander. The Treaty figured in the developing sense of nationhood for some Māori but for the others it did not. For European New Zealanders their sense of nationhood did not embrace the Treaty. Very sophisticated arguments might integrate the Fairburn/Arnold/Phillips arguments about developing or (atomized) communities as part of their argument. These are valid but must link to or provide evidence for or against nationhood in relation to the Treaty.

Candidates should give some idea of what they understand by a 'developing sense of nationhood'.

Source A explains the signing process at Waitangi and how many Māori who signed it lacked an understanding of the significance of their signature. If the significance is minimal at this point, how can its significance 'develop' as an instrument contributing to nationhood by 1900? It introduces the idea that Pakeha believed the Treaty was a tool of assimilation. The source highlights the different expectations that Maori and Pakeha had of the Treaty.

Source B uses some of the key points in Hobson's brief from Lord Normanby. The writer has insisted that Hobson obtain 'free and intelligent consent' and has assumed that there is already a national independence among the Māori of New Zealand. Given the nature of an iwi/hapū-based society this is not a sound assumption. There seems to be knowledge of the Declaration of Independence. But he also gives Hobson a certain amount of discretion to act as he reads the situation. Scholarship candidates could use this to develop an argument that Normanby's eurocentric attitude and the assimilation policy determined that nationhood was on Pakeha terms.

Source C sees the application of the Treaty as an instrument of assimilation through the acquisition of land under the Native Land Acts and through the application of the British Justice system. Those 'zones' that maintained a degree of independence (King Country and Urewera) were gradually brought into the orbit of the law. Any attempts to set up independent Māori authorities were simply not recognised whether they be pan-tribal organisations such as the King movement or local village rūnanga.

This would be evidence that while the settler government was trying to assert its sense of sovereign authority, it was not a model of developing nationhood that all engaged with.

Source D shows where the treaty signings took place and emphasises the role of the missionaries in an assimilation process. Not all Māori signed so to what extent there was 'buy-in' was always going to be in dispute. If Candidates have their own knowledge they might mention that Te Heuheu returned his gifts after they were accepted on his behalf by his nephew. So it was not a comprehensively signed treaty. That will diminish its significance in 1840 and increase the significance of other instruments of a developing nationhood as they define it.

Source E shows the signing over of Lake Wairarapa to the Crown at Papawai. This pā was the seat of the Kotahitanga movement a few short years before. There is a recognition in this photograph that two worlds are mixing in the late nineteenth century and the Kotahitanga Movement is evidence that Māori were forming institutions that were more than just hapū or iwi-based. The existence of the Kotahitanga demonstrates the importance of the Treaty to Maori until 1900. Perhaps a form of proto-nationhood was developing? Candidates could use the Land Court as an example of another instrument of significance in the development of New Zealand's sense of nationhood.

Source F looks at the translations of the Treaty itself. Ruth Ross argues that the language used in the declaration was certainly available in 1840 to convey the idea of independence that was mentioned in Hobson's instructions. The two versions led to two understandings of the Treaty both in 1840 and throughout the nineteenth century. The sovereignty that the British felt was transferred to them in 1840, and that they then asserted over the rest of the century, was the basis of their action, likewise the rangatiratanga that had been retained by Māori who had signed was the basis of their action throughout the century – notwithstanding those who held views in between or pragmatic views depending on the context.

Source F could be used for an argument that those Māori who did attempt to honour the Treaty developed their sense of nationhood as one of resistance to the increasing encroachment of the Pākehā assimilationist actions. It could also be used to argue that Pakeha did not intend the Treaty to create nationhood between Maori & Pakeha.

Source G demonstrates the significance of land sales as another 'instrument' because of its strong role in this agenda. Māori are calling for a Māori Parliament so there is evidence that Māori and Pākehā are not one people. The source gives candidates the opportunity to comment on land sales and courts without giving too much away.

Source H discusses the legal decision that denied Māori the right to pursue any claims based on aboriginal title and calls the treaty a 'legal nullity' because Māori as a tribal society had, as he argued, no legal status. As far as nationhood is concerned this is denying the place of the Treaty. It is also asserting a very Eurocentric or Imperial view of nationhood.

Source I shows that Māori in sending petitions to the Queen were recognising her authority to right wrongs. Some Māori saw the Queen as important in the developing sense of nationhood even though she did not do anything about the petitions. The petitions also demonstrate Maori commitment to the relationship that was established between the Chiefs & Queen Victoria in the Treaty and therefore demonstrate the significance of the Treaty as an instrument of unity.

Source J shows all of the pomp and ceremony of a very Pākehā world (especially in the South Island). It is evidence of no real sense of living together or assimilation. It emphasises the differences in New Zealand in Pākehā and Māori worlds, and to a lesser extent, provides stimulus to think about the differences between the South Island and the North Island. It could be used to argue that there was no nationhood between Maori & Pakeha as it demonstrates the role other instruments, such as settlement played in the development of a Pakeha world.

Source K reveals the assimilationist policy of the Pakeha. It shows Maori concerns about the intention of the Treaty thereby demonstrating that in the years before the New Zealand Wars there was no sense of the Maori & Pakeha being 'one people'.

Source L represents where the population lives by 1901 – both Māori and non-Māori. Candidates can use this to argue that it was a strongly Pākehā nation by 1900. In 1895 some pundits were predicting the demise of the Māori people but of course that was their nadir as far as population was concerned. It is strong evidence for two senses of nationhood if candidates run with that argument.

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 informed 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 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 (NZ)

The Scholarship candidate will show an awareness of historical relationships. These could include relationships such as cause and effect, past and present, specific and general, continuity and change, and pattern and trends, eg:

- Increased Pākehā migration leads to pressure on the Government of the day to provide migrants with land and therefore to assert the sovereignty they believe they have gained under the Treaty.
- Differing interpretations of the Treaty lead to political decisions that have profound effects on race relations.
- Reservations could be made about the relevance of localised interaction as we generalise it to apply to the whole of New Zealand. This is a significant point in relation to the argument because if candidates show that they are aware of the strong iwi and in some areas hapū-based sense of belonging and identity, they can demonstrate the difficulty of any sense of nationhood developing. Similarly for Pākehā, a community sense of nationhood needs caution when weight is placed on generalisations.
- Continuity and change in Māori reaction to assertions of sovereignty in other parts of the country (Ngapuhi not involved with wars of 1860s and many kaupapa fought on the Imperial side).
- The creation of the supra-tribal Kingitanga as a reaction to the Pākehā institution of sovereignty.

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

5. 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.
6. 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.
7. 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 in to this category (at best) as they will not have demonstrated the skill of synthesis needed for PD2.
8. 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 NZ)

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

5. 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.
6. 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.
7. 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 judgements in order to gain a mark of 4 (or have fewer but stronger evaluative points)
8. 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 (NZ)

The Scholarship candidate might:

- refer to the arguments of Orange, Ross, Sorrenson, Belich and Cowan over the Treaty and its interpretation
- refer to the differing perspectives and attitudes of Māori historians such as Walker & Keenan by contrast
- include discussion of views of contemporaries not referred to in the sources and critique them, possibly through using the views that are contained in the sources or vice-versa
- mention the contrasting views of other historians in relation to the wars (eg critique Sinclair by reference to James Belich's arguments). Link to the Treaty or to other instruments
- be prepared to challenge sources that do not sit well with evidence that the candidate brings into the exam
- mention of the Waitangi tribunal and its contribution to our knowledge and understanding since 1975 might be a useful reference point.

Note that when citing historians' views, candidates need to link that argument to the major argument about the place of the Treaty in a developing sense of nationhood.

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

5. 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?
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. 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 (NZ)

The scholarship candidate might

- comment on the need for more specific evidence from the source selection (regional variations, the experiences of kūpapa, the differences between the world of the Māori and the world of the Pākehā, the fact that most Māori and Pākehā lived in separate worlds.
- discuss the limitations of some sources relative to others. What comment on the limitations of single pieces of evidence can be made about the source on the petition or the celebration of Queen Victoria’s Jubilee in Nelson?

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 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 2007

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*

<p>Argument (Skill #1) <i>Respond to the view expressed in the key idea and communicate your own substantiated argument concerning the extent that England experienced a revolution during the period 1603–1660 / the extent to which the Treaty of Waitangi played a pivotal role in the development of New Zealand's sense of nationhood by 1900.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> effectively communicate sophisticated, substantiated argument. PD1 (8 or 7) effectively communicate substantiated argument. PD2 (6 or 5) communicate an argument. PD3 (4) attempt to communicate an argument. PD4 (2) 	<p>Evaluating Historical Narratives (Skill #3) <i>Evaluate historians' interpretations and the views of contemporaries that relate to this historical issue.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> critically evaluate historical narratives (sustained). PD1 (8) critically evaluate historical narratives. PD2 (6) evaluate historical narratives. PD3 (4 or 3) attempt to evaluate historical narratives. PD4 (2 or 1)
<p>Historical Relationships (Skill #4) <i>Demonstrate an understanding of historical relationships relevant to this historical issue, such as cause and effect, past and present, specific and general, continuity and change, and pattern and trends.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrate a thorough and perceptive understanding of historical relationships in selected contexts and settings. PD1 (8 or 7) demonstrate an 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) 	<p>Judgements about Evidence/Research (Skill #2) <i>Make judgements about the nature of historical evidence concerning this historical issue.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop informed and perceptive judgements about the nature of historical evidence and / or historical research. PD1 (8 or 7) make informed judgements about the nature of historical evidence and / or historical research. PD2 (6 or 5) make valid judgements about the nature of historical evidence and / or research. PD3 (4 or 3) attempt to make valid judgements about the nature of historical evidence and / or research. PD4 (2 or 1)
<p>Synthesis of Ideas (Skill #5) <i>Integrate relevant ideas about this historical issue from the evidence in the sources and your own knowledge to develop your argument.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> synthesise, with perception and insight, ideas relevant to the historical context(s) and setting(s). PD1 (8 or 7) synthesise ideas relevant to the historical context(s) and setting(s). PD2 (6 or 5) identify ideas relevant to the historical contexts and settings. PD3 (4 or 3) attempt to identify ideas relevant to the historical contexts and settings. PD4 (2 or 1) 	<p>Understanding of question/context (Skill #6) <i>Demonstrate an understanding of this historical issue through breadth, depth, and balanced coverage.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrate an understanding of the critical underpinnings and scope of an historical question / context. PD1 (8 or 7) understand and define the scope of an historical question / context. PD2 (6 or 5) demonstrate some understanding of the scope of an historical question / context. PD3 (4 or 3) attempt to demonstrate some understanding of the scope of an historical question / context. PD4 (2 or 1)

Total score:

/48