

Assessment Schedule – 2010

Scholarship: History (93403)

ARGUMENT (SKILL No. 1)

Respond to the statement in the task, which is explained in the key idea, and communicate your own substantiated argument concerning the extent to which Elizabeth I should be regarded as a great Queen / the extent of Vogel's significance as a leader in nineteenth century New Zealand.

- Effectively communicate **sophisticated**, substantiated argument. PD1 (8 or 7 marks)
- **Effectively** communicate **substantiated** argument. PD2 (6 or 5 marks)
- **Communicate** an **argument**. PD3 (4 marks)
- [**Attempt** to] communicate an argument. PD4 (2 marks)

Explanatory notes

1. Candidates whose arguments are *sophisticated* (8 or 7 marks) could have demonstrated this through literacy, fluency, insight, elegance, flair, discernment, complexity and / or originality.
2. A candidate will have effectively communicated a *substantiated* argument with a solid argument consistently supported by evidence from the sources and / or their own knowledge (6 marks). A candidate whose argument wavers or drifts in places is likely to gain 5 marks.
3. A candidate who has communicated a relatively simple argument that is not always supported by evidence, or where the argument is in the background rather than explicit, should be awarded a mark of 4.
4. A candidate who is awarded 2 marks has made an attempt to communicate an argument or has written a competent accurate narrative.

Content Possibilities (England)

Scholarship candidates will be able to advance clearly, fluently and logically their own arguments on the extent to which **Elizabeth I** should be regarded as a great Queen.

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 Elizabeth I was truly a great Queen. She inherited a kingdom in chaos yet under her rule, the Anglican Church was established, the currency restored, the Poor Law was introduced in order to provide systematic relief for able-bodied poor, the Spanish Armada was defeated, the circumnavigation of the globe was completed, colonisation was begun, and the arts flourished. All these aspects had a beneficial impact on her realm.
2. That Elizabeth I was not a great Queen as "her power was an illusion – and an illusion was her power." (C. Haigh, *Elizabeth I*, (London: Longman, 1988) p172). Elizabeth and her councillors deliberately manufactured an image of a powerful and successful monarch to disguise her gender and single state, to compensate for the weaknesses of her government, to stifle any opposition and to enhance her status in the eyes of the people. This propaganda was not new but reached new heights under Elizabeth.
3. That Elizabeth I was a relatively successful monarch but she was fortunate to inherit a strong government and administration from her father. Recent historians have rehabilitated the monarchy of Mary Tudor, which suggests that the contrasts with her reign and her sister's was not so marked. 'Fortune' was also in Elizabeth's favour when the Spanish Armada was defeated, for example.
4. That Elizabeth I was an astute and successful monarch. However, her key councillors and courtiers such as Lord Burghley, Earl of Leicester, Sir Francis Walsingham, Sir Christopher Hatton and others played a vital role in making decisions and policies and having them carried out. In particular, William Cecil (Lord Burghley) became her longest serving and most influential advisor and it is often difficult to know what were William Cecil's decisions and policies and which were hers.
5. That Elizabeth I was not a great Queen as she did not try to solve long term problems but simply avoided them. She left them for her successor James I to deal with. She was focused only on her survival as a Queen and on short term pragmatic considerations which would keep her in power.

Candidates should give a clear idea of what they understand by the concept of “leader”. They should identify what they believe the significance of Elizabeth was as a leader or why she was not worthy of the title great Queen and state the extent of their position ie “to some extent”, “to a great extent”, “to a limited extent”. They should also look beyond Elizabeth and consider her courtiers and advisors as well as what she inherited from previous Tudor monarchs/bequeathed monarchs such as the early Stuarts.

Source A1 provides a glowing assessment of Elizabeth’s reign from a historian, who wrote in the middle of the twentieth century, after Britain had repulsed the Germans in the Battle of Britain and was among the victors of this war. He clearly outlines the reasons why he believes that Elizabeth I was a great leader, indeed a heroine, who would be recognised as such by the very people who had heroically led Britain in the war. He suggests that the reign of Elizabeth promoted a golden age in which she inspired the loyalty and love of her people, held division and threats at bay and solved the problems facing the realm in 1558. He dismisses criticisms from the Victorians that simply reflected the ethos of the times and refers, selectively, to contemporaries. Candidates could use this source to support the argument that Elizabeth was widely respected as a great leader by key contemporaries, even foreigners, and even to a twentieth century historian her ability to lead is clear. Alternatively, candidates can criticise the source for its overly romantic view of Elizabeth and note how an historian can write about the past through a lens that is clearly influenced by contemporary events.

Source A2 is an extract from a business/leadership self-help guide that promotes Elizabeth as a great leader with lessons to be learned from her for CEOs today. Candidates could use this source to support an argument that evaluating her as a leader is much more complex than this source suggests and that we do have much to learn from her strategies.

Source B1 is an extract from Sir Robert Naunton, who had been a servant of Essex and also was in the Courts of James I and Charles I. He writes that the key to her political success was her manipulation of factions and that she was able to create and balance factions throughout her reign so that her court was open and ran smoothly. He also writes very favourably of Elizabeth as a leader of her people. Students should be able to question this source in relation to more recent historiography (see below) but also use it to support the idea that Elizabeth’s court was a contrast to the faction-ridden one of James and the closed Caroline court.

Source B2 is a miniature of Elizabeth performing the Royal Maundy Ceremony every year on the Thursday before Easter. In this ceremony, the sovereign symbolically washed the feet of a group of poor people – their number being the same as her age in years – before presenting them with money, food and clothing, in imitation of Christ’s washing of the feet of His disciples before the Last Supper. For Elizabeth, the ceremony was a spectacle through which she could demonstrate her traditional power as a monarch – as God’s Defender of the Faith, Kingdom and love and care for her people. Candidates could discuss the existence of such miniatures as an example of propaganda and use it to support a critical commentary on Elizabeth or use it as an example of her popular appeal.

Source C is a painting of Elizabeth in her privy chamber, receiving the Dutch ambassadors in 1685 to negotiate a treaty with the Dutch Protestants against Spain. It is an imagined scene (note the presence of Mary Queen of Scots, whom Elizabeth never met) but it conveys the formal manner in which she greeted the ambassadors and other visitors to the court in order to impress them with her wealth, power, and security. The emissaries are shown paying homage to the Queen, who is clearly in the centre of it all, surrounded by her key councillors, ladies in waiting, and other nobles – the scene suggests a stage-managed court. It also suggests the importance of Mary Stuart to England in 1585. Candidates could use this source as part of their discussion of Elizabeth’s handling of foreign policy and English fears of a Catholic crusade against Protestant Europe.

Source D is an extract from a very recent article by Norman Jones on the advice that Elizabeth received in her first year as queen. It suggests that Elizabeth faced serious difficulties in 1558 and that she made sound, wise and politically wise decisions. She also chose her councillors well. Candidates could use this source to support the view that Elizabeth was a great leader from the start of her reign; alternatively, candidates could question whether what happened in her first year was indeed a blueprint for the rest of her reign, as Jones suggests. Jones also writes that “councillors advise not advise ...” suggesting that Elizabeth was clearly the decision maker in 1559. However, Jones, in other works, has described Elizabeth as ‘cautious, imperious and conservative’ from 1559 onwards – not laudatory adjectives. Candidates could also use this source to support an argument that it was the councillors such as William Cecil who were crucial to the ‘success’ of Elizabeth as a monarch. They could also note that his views counter the views of some revisionists who criticise

Elizabeth as a 'manufactured' monarch or as simply 'fortunate', or intent on her own survival at all costs.

Sources E1 and E2 are extracts from the Act of Uniformity 1559 and 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 Elizabeth skilfully established a Church that appeased most of her people or could use it to argue that such a compromise satisfied few and left the way open for Catholic rebellion and godly demands for reform. Candidates could use this source to contrast the religious actions of Elizabeth with her sister's – Mary Tudor – and to show that Elizabeth was the more successful. Historians such as Haigh could be brought in here – he argues that the ease with which Mary restored Catholicism suggests that it was not in decline, as was previously thought, and that Elizabeth was aware of this. Duffy, too, says that Catholicism was still strong until the 1580s.

Source F is a satirical take on Elizabeth's stand on the Netherlands, after the failed marriage negotiations with the Duke of Anjou who had been offered the sovereignty of the "United Provinces" against the Spanish. Opposition to the marriage was strong, so Elizabeth closed the match but lent the Duke a large sum of money for his campaign to help the Dutch rebels in the Low Countries. He was not successful, and the failure of the Dutch revolt forced Elizabeth to decide whether to continue supporting them and in what manner. Students could note that this is an image that is clearly not propaganda in Elizabeth's favour (and thus argue that not all propaganda was for Elizabeth) and could support an argument that criticises her foreign policy actions in the Low Countries – her procrastination; her reluctance to militarily support the rebels but at the same time providing financial aid and moral support. Financial restraints faced by Elizabeth were also an important consideration behind her reluctance to pursue a more aggressive foreign policy – this could be used as an example of good leadership in contrast with Charles and Buckingham's desire for war against Spain in the 1620s, for example. Candidates could also argue that Elizabeth acted more wisely in her decisions than Leicester, who ignored Elizabeth's instructions in the Netherlands by accepting the title of Governor General, which implied that she accepted sovereignty over the United Provinces. Candidates could also argue that 'fortune' was responsible for what 'successes' there were in the Netherlands and that Elizabeth's leadership had little to do with it.

Sources G1 and G2 are extracts that reflect on the debate about parliament – John Neale's traditional argument that Elizabeth faced a radical Commons in 1559 (a Puritan choir) that forced her into making a more Protestant settlement than she wished, followed by Michael Graves' revisionist view that Elizabethan parliaments were largely cooperative and homogeneous. This extract could be used by candidates to argue that Elizabeth used the institutions such as parliament in a similar manner as earlier monarchs, that little was different about her relationship with parliament compared to her predecessors. Candidates could note that Neale views Elizabeth through a similar lens as Rowse and is highly complimentary about her ability to stand against those who disagreed or opposed her. Candidates could use these sources to support the view that Elizabeth was a great leader regardless of the historical arguments about her parliaments, or could argue that although there may have been relative harmony between parliaments and the monarch during her reign, areas of conflict emerged under the early Stuarts that suggest that Elizabeth was less than successful.

Sources H1 and H2 reflect on Elizabeth's Irish policy. Source H1 is a contemporary, prejudiced image about the Irish that suggests that English conquest and colonisation were justified on the grounds that the Irish were clearly an inferior, uncouth people. In Source H2, Wallace MacCaffrey is highly critical of the impact of Elizabeth's conquest of Ireland and suggests that it provoked venom and hatred into the present day. He also claims, as a revisionist and critical historian of Elizabeth, that her actions in Ireland reflected her lack of ability to solve the key problems of the realm, including dealing with the Irish rebels, and that she was simply interested in short-term, expedient solutions that limited the risk to her but provided no long-term solutions. The idea that her Irish policy was the 'darkest stain' on her rule. Thus, candidates could use this source to argue that Elizabeth cannot be thought of as a great leader – her failures in Ireland are proof of this. The 'problem' of Ireland was one that future English leaders would have to face.

Source I, by Christopher Haigh, is another revisionist view of Elizabeth that is highly critical of her rule. He suggests that her rule was based on illusion created by the propaganda of Gloriana. This deliberately stage-managed rule arose out of her gender and the fact that she remained unmarried. It worked until she grew old, her trusted advisors had died, and England faced insurmountable problems that James was left to deal with. Candidates could use this source to argue that her mystique was more important than her leadership ability or, on the other hand, could argue that

propaganda was an important tool for her father, for example, or for Charles I and indeed could be seen as a sign of effective leadership.

Sources J1 and J2 reflect on the growth of trade during Elizabeth's reign and the beginnings of an empire. Source J1 is a contemporary source that implies that Elizabeth herself was central to the concept of Empire and instrumental in its beginnings and is an example of Gloriana. It is clearly an example of propaganda as well. Source J2 is maps contrasting the trading routes of England before 1558 and by 1603. Elizabeth backed some of the new trading companies in order to boost the crown's revenues, and there is considerable evidence that the impetus for changes in trade came from the crown and the Privy Council. Candidates could use this source as an example of her leadership, although the actual economic effect of new markets is contentious. Was she primarily responsible for the creation of an empire?

Source K is an extract from revisionist historian Susan Doran, who argues against Christopher Haigh's (and other historians') emphasis on Elizabeth and the idea that her gender and unmarried status have been overstated; that rather than her reign suggesting discontinuity with the past, Elizabeth was a conservative, traditional monarch who faced the same issues as earlier monarchs and those that came after her; her conservatism and reliance on tradition were instrumental to her success. Candidates could use this source to counter the claims of Haigh and also to support the argument that Elizabeth was an exceptionally successful ruler.

Source L is an extract from the Golden Speech that Elizabeth gave 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 her rhetorical ability (a sign of leadership?) 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 and that, as such, might not be entirely accurate. Candidates could also discuss the fact that little was done about monopolies despite her words, which might 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 James and Charles had.

Source M is a well-known portrait of Elizabeth, the Ditchley Portrait, which commemorates the queen's visit to Sir Henry Lee's manor of Ditchley in Oxfordshire during her summer progress in 1592. Elizabeth is shown standing in the heavens (on a globe) on a map of England, with her feet on Oxfordshire, and turning away from the stormy sky towards the sun. From her left ear hangs a jewelled armillary sphere, and in her hand is a folding fan. The Tudor rose adorns her dress, and it is studded with pearls. Candidates could refer to the symbolism in the portrait. In the sonnet within the cartouche, she is referred to as "The Prince of Light." Candidates can refer to this source as a clear example of Gloriana; however, it was commissioned by Sir Henry Lee himself (and thus the personal motives of him are important – he wanted to flatter her as previously he had offended her) and the Queen's face appears as a much older woman. The date 1592 could be noted by candidates who argue that the reality of her rule in 1590s was not reflected in this image.

Content Possibilities (New Zealand)

Scholarship candidates will be able to advance clearly, fluently and logically their own arguments on the **extent of Vogel's significance as a leader in nineteenth century New Zealand**.

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 Julius Vogel was a very significant leader in nineteenth century New Zealand. New Zealand was an underdeveloped country, and Vogel was the only leader with a clear vision for New Zealand's political, economic and therefore social prospects. Vogel's vision had a significant impact on the development of nineteenth century New Zealand.
2. That Julius Vogel was a very significant leader in nineteenth century New Zealand. Vogel's vision was responsible for the long depression of the 1880s, and this event had a negative impact on New Zealand by the end of the century.
3. Julius Vogel was a very significant political leader. New Zealand was an underdeveloped country, and Vogel was the only leader with a clear vision for the political and economic development of the country. However, despite his immigration plan, his vision was an economic one and he lacked vision with regard to the social development of New Zealand and, in particular, the issue of race. Other leaders such as Grey, Te Kooti, the Maori King, Atkinson, Ballance, Seddon were more significant.

4. That Julius Vogel was a very important nineteenth century New Zealand leader. Vogel's clear political and economic vision had a significant impact on the development of nineteenth century New Zealand. However, there were other leaders who were as important and the combined effect of the contributions of leaders such as Vogel, Grey, Atkinson, Ballance, Seddon was more significant across the whole period. It is anachronistic to look at Vogel as the main political or economic development.
5. Julius Vogel was not significant. His plan led to the depression, which had a very negative impact on New Zealand. Other leaders were more important and/or the combined effect of the contributions of other leaders such as Vogel, Grey, Atkinson, Ballance, Seddon was more significant across the whole period. It is anachronistic to look at Vogel as the main political or economic development.

Candidates should give some idea of what they understand by the concept of "leader". They should identify what they believe the significance of Vogel was as a leader or why Vogel was not significant and state the extent of their position ie "to some extent", "to a great extent", "to a limited extent". They should look beyond Vogel and consider leaders before and after Vogel.

Source A provides an overview of Vogel's political career. It outlines Dalziel's ideas that before Vogel, New Zealand had no economic policies and that Vogel was responsible for the development of significant economic policies that were necessary because of the stagnation of the economy in the late 1860s. It could be used to support the argument that Vogel was a significant leader as New Zealand faced a number of economic problems throughout the nineteenth century and that no other leader had developed a policy to improve the economic situation in New Zealand. The Source also includes information on the many positions held by Vogel and his immigration policies and abolition of the provinces. This information could be used to support the idea that although Vogel may be criticised for his contribution to the depression, his contributions to the nineteenth century are more extensive than just economic and an evaluation of his leadership must look beyond his economic policies. It also supports the argument of Hawke, Burdon, and Saunders that Vogel took on too much too soon and that this was a failure of his leadership.

Source B1 and Source B2 are political cartoons that were published in 1887 following Vogel's return to office as a Colonial Treasurer member in Robert Stout's ministry. Other politicians, including Harry Atkinson, advocated retrenchment while Vogel proposed spending as a method of getting New Zealand out of the recession. In the 1887 general election, Vogel retained his seat but the government was defeated. Source B1 shows the contemporary view of many that Vogel was responsible for the long depression, which supports the argument that Vogel was a significant leader in the sense that he had such a negative impact on nineteenth century New Zealand. Source B2 suggests that Vogel was made a scapegoat for the recession. It could be used to support the argument that Vogel was a great leader and his decisions could be contrasted with those of Atkinson, Hall, and Grey, who adopted many methods of getting New Zealand out of the recession but failed. It could also be used to argue that Vogel was not the most significant leader of the nineteenth century as his decisions were not made in isolation but with the support and contribution of a number of politicians in a number of different ministries.

Source C1 puts forward the argument that New Zealand did experience a depression between 1870 and 1890, whereas Source C2 argues that it was a period of stagnation not depression. These Sources could be used to support the idea that Vogel was a significant leader as his plans to borrow money and to develop New Zealand's infrastructure helped to bring recession to an end and refute the idea that his plans were the cause of the recession. Alternatively, the Source could be used to support the idea that his borrowing played a significant role in New Zealand's economic debt.

Source D1 establishes the argument that the Liberal government has been regarded as a populist and progressive government but that their social legislation was restrictive as much as it was inclusive. Candidates could use this source to compare Liberal leadership with that of Vogel to advance the argument that Vogel was the most significant 19th century leader despite history's preoccupation with the policies of the Liberal Government and the idea that they made New Zealand 'God's own country' and the 'Social Laboratory of the World'. It could be used to support the argument that the Liberal party/Balance/Seddon were the most significant leaders of the nineteenth century as their policies (despite their limitations) were more far reaching than the largely economic policies of Vogel. Source D1 could be used to advance the argument that Seddon was a very significant political leader of the nineteenth century or the most significant leader.

Source E demonstrates the growth in immigration to New Zealand in two key periods – the 1860s and the 1870s. Candidates could use Sources E1 and E2 to argue that Vogel's immigration schemes were more successful than those of the New Zealand Company and, therefore, advance the idea that he

was a significant leader. Source E1 could also be used to argue that the gold rush had as significant an impact as the schemes of Vogel and contribute to the argument that it is anachronistic to look at Vogel as the most significant leader, that there were a number of developments over the century that make it difficult to argue the case for one leader over another. Source E2 could be used to support the argument that Vogel's leadership had a negative impact on nineteenth century New Zealand because his policies contributed to the depression, which contributed to the emigration or 'exodus' of the 1880s.

Source F provides a summary of the condition of New Zealand society by 1890. It could be used to support the argument that neither Vogel nor any other leader was the most significant leader as New Zealand was far from an ideal society by the end of the century. The source could also be used to argue that Vogel was a significant leader and that he had played a major role in a number of the developments that made New Zealand a good place to live by the end of the century, ie a central political system that had led to the development of both islands, his role in the passing of the Married Women's Property Act, the development of infrastructure that improved lives of everyday people.

Sources G1 and G2 demonstrate the failings of both the Wakefield and Vogel migration schemes. These sources could be used to argue the inability of Vogel to make his plans work. They could also be used to argue that Vogel did not work in isolation but with other ministers, including Isaac Featherston, who had the responsibility for immigration and, therefore, Vogel cannot be blamed for the weaknesses of his schemes. Source G1 could be used to argue that Vogel's schemes were more successful than those of Wakefield demonstrating his significance as a leader and that as demonstrated in Source G2, it was the recession that led to problems for migrants.

Source H demonstrates that contemporary views of Vogel differed greatly. Dalziel outlines Pember Reeves' view that Vogel contributed significantly to the social and economic development of New Zealand, whereas Alfred Saunders is critical of Vogel's short-sightedness and arbitrariness. Candidates could use this source to argue the case that it is anachronistic to look at one leader as being the most significant. Pember Reeves suggests that Governor Grey's race and land policies contributed to land speculation. Candidates could argue that this demonstrates that Vogel's Plan was a necessity in the 1870s or that his actions cannot be viewed in isolation and that the events and, therefore, leadership before the 1870s must be taken into consideration. Saunders' views could be used to argue that Vogel was not the most significant leader and that the Liberals were.

Source I1 is a photo of the Rimutakas before the construction of a railway line in 1878 and demonstrates the importance of Vogel's plan to develop the infrastructure of New Zealand and could be used to support the idea that Vogel was a significant leader. Source I2 is a photo of a railway opening in Westland in the 1880s; the importance of this is demonstrated by the scale of the event and the support of the community and also supports the idea that Vogel was a significant leader. Candidates could argue that the construction of railways continued after Vogel and that the Liberal government constructed the main trunk line through the North Island, opening up economic opportunities there and highlighting the limitations of Vogel's Plan, which centred the construction of railway on the South Island and demonstrating the significance of the Liberals as leaders of the nineteenth century.

Source J demonstrates the importance of development in nineteenth century New Zealand. In Source J1, Belich argues that New Zealand was in a progressive phase from 1840 to 1880. This could be used to support the idea that Vogel's Plans cannot be seen in isolation and that the contributions of a number of leaders and governments was as important as the contribution of Vogel including that of Hobson, Grey, Atkinson, Seddon etc. It could also be used to argue the importance of Vogel in that he recognised the need to progress and implemented his infrastructure and immigration schemes in order to do so. Source J2 is a quote from Vogel supporting the importance of progression to New Zealand. This source could also be used to argue that Vogel's vision was based on ambition rather than sound economic thinking and that this is evidence of the significant contribution he made to New Zealand's depression.

Source K could be used to argue that Vogel has been immortalised as a hero of nineteenth century New Zealand's history ballads and poems such as this one written by significant New Zealand poet Allen Curnow. Equally it could be used to argue that colonists have a tendency to attach the title of hero to significant figures but that this does not always equate to their achievements in history. The poem implies that the aspirations of settlers were not attained and the candidate could build on the idea that this demonstrates that Vogel was not a significant leader.

Source L introduces the idea that land monopoly and the existence of great estates was a major economic problem in nineteenth century New Zealand. It could be used to argue that Vogel was not a significant leader because he failed to deal with the problem of land monopoly because his plan to set aside land reserves to fund railways failed as land monopolists bought the land with borrowed money

and speculated, therefore, rising the price of the land. It could also be used to argue that Vogel's plan was not one of the contributory factors to recession, ongoing economic problems in New Zealand such as land speculation were. The success of the policies of the Liberals to break up large estates could be cited to attribute significance to them as leaders.

Source M demonstrates Vogel's role in social policy as Vogel's government proposed the first Women's Suffrage Bill in 1887. The source could be used to argue Vogel's significance in that his policies attempted to deal with political, economic and social issues. It demonstrates that Vogel was a visionary leader.

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 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 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.

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.

- Cause and effect: what actions did Elizabeth take to deal with the issues facing England? How much was she herself able to shape events? What impact did Elizabeth's actions/decisions actually have? Was she solely responsible for a Golden Age? How much did Elizabeth rely on her councillors for advice? How far did Elizabeth formulate policy?
- 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?
- Continuity and change: was Elizabeth's reign much more successful than the monarchs that followed her, as Neale and Rowse suggest; how far did Elizabeth rely on the foundation of previous monarchs to rule England successfully? Was she, as David Starkey suggests, following on from the tradition of father, Henry VIII? How well did she deal with the problems facing England in 1558, and how many problems did she bequeath to James in 1603? Candidates should have a good grasp of the problems facing Elizabeth, the strategies she used to deal with them, and her relative success and failure.
- Continuity and change? Did Elizabeth's first year set the stage for the rest of her reign, as Norman Jones suggests? How far did Elizabeth's last years of her reign show a significant change in the style and success of her leadership? The last 15 years were certainly less successful – historians agree on that – was she a less great queen because of this?
- How do present-day historians view Elizabeth? How much do events in the present-day influence how historians view Elizabeth as a leader? Do we today have a different notion of leadership than in the past? 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? Why have historians since 2003 been more favourable about her legacy than historians in the 1980s?

- Patterns and trends: How different was Elizabeth's rule to other monarchs of the period? Was the legacy of the leadership of her father and siblings so significant that Elizabeth was forced to take drastic different actions? Was England doomed without Elizabeth's reign?

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

Content possibilities (New Zealand)

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

- Cause and effect: The problems facing the development of New Zealand's economy included the distance from markets, the lack of infrastructure, the non-renewable resources, dependence on imports. These problems necessitated the development of a strategy to develop New Zealand's economy
- Cause and effect: Economic stagnation in the 1860s and the 'boom and bust' cycle led to the need for a plan such as that of Vogel.
- Cause and effect: The aspirations of the settlers led to expectations of economic development.
- Cause and effect: The differences between the North Island and the South Island such as the discovery of gold in the South Island, the availability of land, race relations issues in the North led to parochialism and the emergence of strong political leaders such as Vogel who advocated for political/economic change. Provincial rivalries influenced national politics.
- Continuity and change – Did Vogel's borrowing lead to the depression? Was there a depression, or was it a period of stagnation? Did public and private debt increase or decrease any more or any less during the government of Atkinson than those of Vogel?
- Continuity and change – Did Vogel's plan change the lives of all New Zealanders? The changing experience of New Zealanders during and after the depression ie sweated labour, poverty and the emergence of the Liberals. Did the policies of the Liberals have a considerably more positive effect on the lives of nineteenth century New Zealanders than those of Vogel?
- Continuity and change: Vogel centralised New Zealand politics, but parochialism remained.
- Past and present: With the rise of social history and the consolidation of race and gender as key analytical concerns within New Zealand historiography, historians have turned their attention away from political history and/or have viewed politicians such as Vogel from 'below'. Vogel has not been incorporated into the historical dialogue enough in recent years.
- Past and present: Why do revisionist historians view Vogel differently from his contemporaries? How much did events in the twentieth century influence how historians viewed a leader? Do we today have a different notion of leadership than in the past?
- Patterns and trends: Was the legacy of the leadership of the Governors, in particular Grey and Maori/land policy so significant that Vogel was forced to take drastic action in the form of significant loans and spending? Was New Zealand's economy doomed without the advent of Vogel? Candidates should demonstrate their knowledge on the development of New Zealand's economy from 1840 until the Vogel schemes and the economic schemes of leaders after Vogel. They should also be able to compare the immigration schemes of Wakefield and Vogel.

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 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 and New Zealand)

For the type of ideas that a candidate might draw from the sources to incorporate into their argument, see content possibilities for argument (skill 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 (at least one genuine attempt) or 1 mark (a glimmer!) has to have attempted to make an evaluative comment about the views of historians and/or contemporaries concerning the historical issue.

Content possibilities (England)

The Scholarship candidate might:

- comment on and discuss the different historians' interpretations about Elizabeth as a monarch and the impact of her actions; students should know the basic ideas of Neale and Rowse, whose views are highly complimentary, in contrast to the views of Haigh and MacCaffrey, whose views are very critical.
- critique the contrasting views of historians on Elizabeth's rule: ie Rowse and Neale both 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 their views of Elizabethan England facing the religious conflict between Catholicism and Protestantism reflects the ideological conflict of the Cold War. Students could note that critics of Elizabeth are rarer than those who praise her and ask why this is. On the other hand, both Haigh and MacCaffrey use gender stereotypes when criticizing Elizabeth; Elizabeth has been marginalised by both historians – perhaps this reflects a changing view of power and government with an emphasis on how the different parts work together rather than on the central ruler. Haigh in particular argues that Elizabeth must be examined in terms of power rather than the success or failure of her policies and that her ability to rule was severely curtailed at times by restraints such as institutions, lack of finance, her gender etc. Their respective views that Elizabeth was a 'manufactured' monarch or a 'fortunate' monarch could be critiqued.
- comment on the fact that no feminist historians have been included in this paper; discussion of historians such as Carole Levien could be included by candidates.
- comment on the fact that historians such as Simon Adams and his work on the court of Elizabeth has not been included; recent work has suggested that Mary Tudor was a more successful monarch than had previously been thought, yet no source reflects on this.
- ask why contemporaries such as Naunton were largely complimentary towards Elizabeth. Is it simply because negative images were usually suppressed? Other contemporary opinion could be contrasted with Naunton.
- comment on the importance of gender when discussing the relative success of Elizabeth as monarch. Contrast the views of Doran with those of Haigh and MacCaffrey, particularly in relation to the cult of Gloriana.
- comments on the fact that very recent historiography such as by Norman Jones and David Starkey has more in common with the views of Neale and Rowse than with the critical views of the historians of the 1580s. Why might this be?
- comment on the fact that many Britons still consider Elizabeth to be the greatest ruler of England.
- comment specifically on the historiography surrounding the Elizabethan Settlement – Neale, Jones, Starkey, Duffy, Collinson, Doran, Bossy et al

Note that when citing historians' views, candidates need to link those view(s) to their argument about the extent to which Elizabeth can be regarded as a great Queen.

Content possibilities (New Zealand)

The Scholarship candidate might:

- comment on the view of Raewyn Dalziel that Julius Vogel was the man who had the clearest vision for New Zealand's bleak economic prospects
- recognise the view of Russell Stone that New Zealand was an underdeveloped country and that Vogel's Plan was necessary because the economy would not prosper as long as "communications were bad and regions were isolated from each other" and that New Zealand did not have economic viability because of its shortage of staple exports, which meant that there was no money to fund future economic projects or to ensure a good standard of living. W J Gardner and Dalziel agree.
- recognise the views of Keith Sinclair that nineteenth century New Zealand politics was dominated by oligarchies and 'pork barrel' politics
- critique the contrasting views of historians on Vogel's role in causing the depression, ie Condliffe and Sutch blamed Vogel and his boom policies for the bust of the Long Depression, Dalziel and Hawke have argued that Vogel's policies did not cause the Depression, but that New Zealand suffered because it had a dependent economy, based on a only a few export staples, which were affected by overseas economic pressure. Gary Hawke argues that if we accept the commonly

accepted definition (a real decline in income), there wasn't actually a depression in the 1880s. They provide evidence that prices fell as quickly as wages.

- include the view of Revisionist David Hamer, who wrote that there was an extinguishing of provincialism and a collapse of the establishment; and rise of democracy with the Liberal Party not Vogel
- compare the contemporary views of William Pember Reeves, who argued that Vogel's Plan brought mostly benefits to New Zealand's economy and society, and Alfred Saunders, who argued that Vogel caused the Depression
- comment on the fact that most historians including Miles Fairburn emphasise the impact of the depression. This included bankruptcy, unemployment, out-migration, with more people leaving New Zealand than arriving, and an increase in sweated labour with male workers being replaced with cheaper labour (women and children).
- contrast the views of contemporaries such as William Pember Reeves, who compared the Wakefield migrants with the Vogel migrants and argued the superiority of the Wakefield settlers, with the view of revisionist Rollo Arnold that Vogel's migrants were more successful
- discuss the idea of 'progression'. Candidates should recognise the ideas of Belich that progressive colonisation dominated New Zealand in the second half of the nineteenth century and that this progression was characterised by optimism and settler demand for development. They might use this idea to evaluate Tony Ballantyne's view of the Liberal government – that it was a regime that was both progressive and autocratic.

Note that when citing historians' views, candidates need to link those view(s) to their argument about the extent of Vogel's significance to nineteenth century New Zealand.

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 [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!) must have attempted to make a judgement about the nature of the historical evidence available to them as they address the historical issue.

Content possibilities (England)

The Scholarship candidate might:

- comment on the need for more specific evidence from the source selection about the institutions of government; financial problems facing the crown; Mary Stuart and the dangers Elizabeth faced with her presence in England; the succession and marriage negotiations; selected courtiers and advisors such as Lord Burghley
- discuss the nature of evidence. For example, What is the purpose of images such as B2, sources C and M? How did such images work? Recognise the important symbolism in such portraits and comment on the limitations of such portraits to evaluate her success as monarch. What was the purpose behind source B1 (Naunton's commentary on Elizabeth's reign)? In what ways were Sources F and H satirical? Who might have been the intended audience?
- comment on the need for more information in the maps in source J.
- 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 such as the Golden Speech in source L? How were parliamentary speeches recorded? In Source A2 – does such a source have any value for an historian, or is it overly simplified and worthless? What are the limitations of the views of a Whig historian such as John Neale? Comment on the need to contrast his views with those of Michael Graves. Comment on the limitations of paintings to evaluate Elizabeth as a monarch. Comment on the criticisms of MacCaffrey about Elizabeth's Irish policy.
- comment on the need for more evidence of statutes to judge Elizabeth's responses to problems
- comment on the obvious bias behind the sources H1 and J1.

Content possibilities (New Zealand)

The Scholarship candidate might:

- comment on the need for more specific evidence from the source selection including information on gender issues, alternative leaders, statistics on borrowing, contemporary accounts of the experience of the depression, views of migrants on Vogel, the effects of policy on Māori
- discuss the nature of evidence eg: What is the purpose of the scapegoat and leaps and bounds cartoons in Source B? Why were the photos taken in Source I? What were the circumstances surrounding these photographs? What statistics are missing in the graphs in Source E? How was the data collected in Source E?
- 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 Vogel's speech in Source J and Dalziel's biography in Source A? What are the limitations of the views of an economic historian such as Sutch in Source C? Comment on the need to contrast the views of Sutch with those of economic historian Gary Hawke.
- comment on the need for more information about the response of governments to the recession / depression
- comment on the bias of biographers such as Dalziel and contemporaries such as Pember Reeves
- comment on the fact that Stone's history was written in 1969.

UNDERSTANDING OF QUESTION / CONTEXT (SKILL No. 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 marks 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 to which they agree or disagree with the notion, candidates should 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 2010**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; 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 of 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 No.: _____ Option: *England or New Zealand*

<p>Argument (Skill No. 1) <i>Respond to the view expressed in the key idea and communicate your own substantiated argument concerning the extent to which Queen Elizabeth should be regarded as a great Queen in Early Modern England / the extent of Julius Vogel's significance as a leader in nineteenth century New Zealand.</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 No. 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 No. 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 No. 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 No. 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 No. 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