

## Assessment Schedule – 2009

### 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 Charles I was the catalyst for change in Early Modern England / the extent to which the formation of the Kingitanga was a catalyst for change 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 about the extent to which the attitudes and actions of King Charles I influenced the outcome of civil war in 1642. Candidates will need to be able to debate the extent to which Charles subscribed to particular political and religious beliefs that made him less able than either Elizabeth or James to deal successfully with the situation he inherited in 1625, and the extent to which his personality or temperament was distinctive from his predecessors.

Candidates are likely to show in their opening paragraph an argument that establishes their position in relation to how far Charles was pivotal to the outbreak of civil war AND/OR the underlying weaknesses of the archaic state in evidence before Charles succeeded the throne AND/OR how far other people / factors were essential to the rise of tension. There are several possibilities:

1. That Charles was ill-equipped in terms of character, convictions and ability to perform well as a king and made serious errors in dealing with crisis situations as they emerged.
2. That Charles has been viewed too critically by many historians. Indeed, it was his effectiveness to form a king's party, rather than his personal defects, that was able to fight against the junto that brought about civil war.
3. That the existing structure of personal monarchy could not cope with the growing social, economic and political problems facing early modern England, leading to a "functional breakdown" of the governing system in which the King was unable to govern according to traditional precepts. He was, therefore, forced to develop new measures (ably supported by Laud and Wentworth) that brought about resistance from a conservative governing class.
4. That it was always likely that the English monarchy would face a crisis of some kind during the seventeenth century, as wars fought by Elizabeth and James had highlighted the inadequacy of its financial and administrative system which urgently needed to be overhauled. Other European kingdoms in the period were also challenged in meeting new problems for government.
5. That England under Personal Rule did not suggest the possibility of civil war, as the country was relatively peaceful and united; it was the defeat in the Bishops' War that began the road to civil war. (It would be possible to argue that had Charles won against the Scots, civil war would have been less likely).
6. That other factors, such as the interdependent religious and constitutional issues, played the crucial part in the evolving crisis.

Candidates should give a clear idea of what they understand to have been the pivotal factors leading to civil war. Candidates should also state their position in relation to the continuum (the extent – some, a great deal, not much etc). They should be able to debate the issue of Charles's importance as an individual and the significance of his personality and beliefs on the outcome of events.

Source A1 is a short extract from Charles Carlton's study of the psychology of Charles I, which states that he developed an authoritarian personality to cover an underlying sense of his inadequacy. What is implied is that it was Charles's personality – not his beliefs or actions as such – that created the difficulties between him and his parliaments. Students could criticise the source by arguing that it is not possible to understand the psychology of the past, or accept it and/or discuss aspects of Charles I life that led to a lack of self-confidence and the reliance on Buckingham/Henrietta Maria – this dependence had serious consequences for his rule. Source A2 is connected in that it is an extract from the Earl of Clarendon (Edward Hyde) who, during the Restoration, wrote his account of the civil war – titled *History of the Great Rebellion* – from a conservative standpoint and as a supporter in the war of the King. He wrote as a participant in events of the 1630s onwards as well as the first historian of the period. It could be used to corroborate A1 in that Charles is described as not "trusting himself enough", thus leading to a dependence on others with less talent. Students could argue that since Clarendon was one of Charles's main advisors in the 1640s, Clarendon's description of the King is not reliable because it suggests that Charles was more the victim than the perpetrator. Students could also argue that Charles had other defects that are not suggested by either of these extracts.

Source B shows the image that Charles wanted to portray to his public during Personal Rule, even at a time when England was at war against the Scots. Charles is portrayed as the conquering hero, clad in jousting armour and wielding the baton of command. The depiction of the king on horseback deliberately echoed the Roman emperors. The inscription is a reminder of his status as king of Great Britain at a time that this was being contested by the Scots. Candidates should be able to detail how the painting reflects on his view of the monarchy and the style of his court. Candidates should link the painting to key elements of Charles's court – virtue, order and harmony – (in contrast to James's) and to Charles as a keen patron of the arts that would glorify the Stuart dynasty. Like those of Elizabeth, paintings of Charles usually reflected a majestic image; but whereas Elizabeth successfully used images and the magnificence of the court as propaganda tools, Charles did no such thing, as the paintings remained in royal palaces or in nobles' great houses and so few were able to view them.

Source C is an extract from Kevin Sharp's work on the period of Personal Rule. This is a revisionist historiographical position as he challenges the Whig position that the eleven years amounted to "eleven years of tyranny". The term "Personal Rule" is a more neutral description of the period, and Sharp argues that it was a period of positive reform that Charles vigorously pursued for the good of an orderly commonwealth. Sharp disputes those who view the years 1629 to 1640 as accelerating the path to civil war because the King's policies intensified conflict between the Crown and subjects. Sharp states that the 1630s are simply viewed through Charles's opponents' eyes; that Charles pursued a positive programme of reform, guided by his clear vision of church and state; that opposition to his policies has been exaggerated; and that these years were years of stability and calm. Sharp suggests, therefore, that the personal rule was not a period of innovation. This extract would support the argument that Charles's personality and personal beliefs had a direct influence on the nature of government and policy during these years. Candidates could use this extract to debate whether Charles was trying to establish royal absolutism or whether England in the 1630s were the "halcyon days", only to be interrupted by an unsuccessful war against the Scots.

Source D is an extract from another revisionist historian, Conrad Russell, whose work *The Causes of the English Civil War* has offered a synthesis of traditional and revisionist views. Russell draws attention to the interaction of longer-term factors such as the monarchy's financial problems, religious divisions and "the problem of multiple kingdoms" that were brought to a head by Charles I. This extract could support the argument that Charles was a pivotal cause of the civil war as in his hands, problems relating to different parts of his three realms interacted to take matters beyond his control.

Source E1 contains two woodcuts illustrating the level of ridicule and hostility towards Laud and fellow Arminian churchmen from the end of the 1630s. The Arminian reforms proved very controversial and seemed to many to be reminiscent of Catholicism. The inclusion of two lawyers in the Court of High Commission illustrates the widespread resentment of Laud's heavy suppression of godly practices through the prerogative power of this Court and the Star Chamber. The woodcuts suggest that Laud and his associates are responsible for bringing the "ship" of Laudianism to destruction and shows that "justice" will be meted out by the due process of parliament and by divine judgement. Source E2 is yet another satirical attack on Archbishop Laud but focuses on the Canons of 1640 that emerged from the Convocation in May 1640. Hollar's cartoon is a pun on the canons. At the top of the page is the oath that all clergy had to take. Laud's "canons" have exploded in his face, and the oath is falling short of its mark. The provisions in the Canons were the "high-water mark of Laudian self-confidence" (David Cressy), yet the authority and power of the Laudian church was already under attack. Godly clergy balked at the canons, particularly the "etcetera" oath that required every minister to swear that the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England contained "all things necessary to salvation" and that they would never consent "to alter the government of this church by archbishops, bishops, deans and archdeacons, etc, as it stands now established". The unpopularity of the canons was vast, and this engraving reflects the opposition and the divisiveness of Laud's ill-timed action. The woodcuts are typical of the strident anti-episcopal polemic expressed in pulpits and pamphlets and in the streets,

and suggest that Archbishop Laud and the episcopacy were responsible for England's troubles. Candidates could use the sources to argue that Charles alone was responsible for the religious divisiveness that faced England in the 1630s onwards or that Laud was the "evil counsellor" driving the "ship" into a terrible storm/misfiring the canons or perhaps that the King and Laud worked in partnership – Charles providing the general direction but Laud making practical steps to achieve it.

Source F shows a painting from the nineteenth century of Charles's attempt to arrest five of his principal opponents in the Commons on a charge of treason. Candidates could use the picture and the accompanying quotation from the Speaker, William Lenthall, to argue that Charles's action was disastrous as he was shown to be overriding the privileges of parliament and willing to take violent and arbitrary action. Charles had undone the work done by more moderate Royalists such as Edward Hyde and Viscount Falkland to present the opposition as simply extremists, roused public opinion to fever pitch, as the cry "Privilege of Parliament" suggests, and given credibility to rumours of a Catholic plot. Candidates could conceivably argue, What if Charles had been successful in his decision to arrest the MPs or that Charles was "right" to try to turn the tables on his opponents as there were strong rumours that the Queen was about to be impeached?

Source G contains an extract from Richard Cust's work on the importance of Charles's political beliefs as expressed in the performance of the royal masques, and an illustration of John Webb's design for the final scene of the masque of *Salmacida Spolia*. Candidates should recognise that just as the portraits of Charles in the 1630s suggested the power of the monarch to impose order on chaos, so too did the Court masques that were performed regularly throughout the personal rule. Candidates could consider how the masques were representative of court life which was the clearest expression of Charles's personality and political vision (comparisons with Elizabeth's *Gloriana* and James's relaxed, informal and slovenly court could be made) in developing an argument about the importance of the personal monarch himself in the direction the kingdom took. Candidates could argue that Charles was not the first monarch to seek to enhance majesty through such means as masques but that unlike Elizabeth, for example, he did so to a very limited audience within the confines of the palace and that this proved to be politically damaging and could help explain his failure.

Source H contains tables showing the overall growth in population from 1522 to 1656 and the rise in prices over a similar period of time. The tables are a "rough guide" to economic trends. Candidates could use these tables as a starting point to discussing the structural weaknesses/problems facing a king like Charles, which undermined his ability to rule effectively. Candidates could make an assumption that the tables suggest that population pressure outstripped the resources of English agriculture and so probably led to the "price revolution", but it is very difficult to establish that this problem was directly a cause of civil war.

Source I is a satirical engraving titled "England's Miraculous Preservation" 1646 after the royalist defeat at the Battle of Naseby. It shows that Houses of Parliament were keeping England "afloat" despite the efforts of Charles and his wife and key supporters to overturn the ark. Students could use this to discuss how Charles's parliamentary opponents would argue that the failure of Charles's character, actions and beliefs were the cause of civil war and that God was on the side of the parliamentary foes. Candidates could also use the source as a starting point to a discussion of Charles's failed military leadership in the Civil War.

Source J is an extract from Richard Cust's recent book on Charles, which argues that critical judgements from historians in the past on Charles's unfitness to rule are not adequate in explaining how Charles managed to build up support to challenge the *junto* and be an effective leader of the royalist cause. Cust, then, argues that it was Charles's effectiveness as a leader that brought about civil war but concludes that, nonetheless, his mishandling of political crises did much to bring about a civil war. Candidates could use this source to support an argument that Charles was pivotal to the outbreak of war yet could criticise other sources/historians for their portrayal of Charles as incompetent.

Source K1 is simply a list of the titles that the Duke of Buckingham held as quoted in the Commons's impeachment of him. A candidate could use this source as a starting point in a discussion of the extent of Buckingham's influence on Charles – who was leading whom? Was it Buckingham who created the problems for Charles in the early years of his reign? How different was Charles as King before/after Buckingham's death? A candidate could also use this source in a discussion of the legacy of James. Source K2 is Charles's justification for having Buckingham as his chief advisor, for his good qualities – Charles interpreted the Commons's attack on Buckingham as an attack on himself and insisted that he had the prerogative to appoint his ministers. Candidates could make links to the nature of Charles's formal and dignified court that cut off accessibility to the King. Discussion of Charles's reaction to impeachment proceedings could also be linked to his failings as a king.

Source L1 contains the words that Strafford apparently spoke in the Privy Council that the King should use the Irish army "to reduce this kingdom". It was argued by his accusers that Strafford meant England, not Scotland, and that he sought to destroy parliament. The evidence is questionable as the note was produced by Harry Vane, the son of Sir Henry Vane, who had discovered the note in his fathers' papers – it was supposedly a record of what Strafford

had said. Source L2 is Wenceslaus Hollar's engraving of the execution of Strafford – the quotation supports the image of the huge crowd gathered to witness the execution as they were delighted by his death. The popularity of his execution hides, however, the difficulty with which Pym and others had in impeaching Strafford. Candidates could use the sources to argue that Charles alone was responsible for trying to establish "arbitrary government" or that Strafford was the king's other "evil counsellor", who was the "architect" of the policy of Thorough in Ireland.

Source M – The benefits of the reign of James I (installed 1637) – is an image from the ceiling of Banqueting House. The source is an allegory illustrating the virtues of Charles's father as Peacemaker, where Peace and Abundance embrace while James watches as War is sent off (by Wisdom – out of the picture). The source could be used to corroborate the messages behind the royal masques – "the harmonising and civilising power of the king's virtue" (Cust), or to debate the legacy of James, or to contrast the rule of James as the Peacemaker King with Charles.

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

Scholarship candidates will be able to advance clearly, fluently and logically their own arguments about the extent to which **the formation of the Kingitanga was a catalyst for change 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 the Kingitanga was pivotal to change in the nineteenth century. Governors Gore-Browne and Grey saw the Kingitanga as a threat to Pākehā authority and to land accessibility in the central North Island. As a direct result of the formation of the Kingitanga, Grey constructed the Great South Road in order to invade the Waikato and secure Pākehā sovereignty. Pākehā success in this war led to the acquisition of land through various means and the establishment of Pākehā political and economic dominance. This fear of the authority of the King demonstrates that to Pākehā, the wars were about sovereignty. Upon the conclusion of the Wars, Māori sovereignty was restricted by legislation such as the 1867 Māori Representation Act, the Native Settlements Act and the Native Schools Act.
2. That the Kingitanga itself was the result of Pākehā land hunger was the most significant catalyst for change. The growing number of Pākehā settlers and their assumption of cultural superiority made their desire for Māori land irrepressible. This was evident in the Teira vs Kingi clash over land sales to Wakefield and the subsequent Taranaki Wars. The invasion of the Waikato to access land was inevitable regardless of the formation of the Kingitanga. This was evident after the conclusion of the Wars as Māori land was acquired via confiscation and through the establishment of the Native Land Court. In this regard, the Kingitanga was a means to an end for the Pākehā government.
3. That competing assertions of sovereignty and land were the catalysts for change and that the formation of the Kingitanga symbolised the significance of both of these factors. Land retention was crucial to sovereignty, and the Kingitanga was formed to retain the land and, therefore, Māori mana. Kingi resisted the Pākehā in Taranaki to retain land and the mana of the Ati Awa. Competing assertions of sovereignty and the right to land led to significant change that included the Wars and the laws that followed the wars. The resistance movements of Te Kooti and Titokowaru and Te Whiti demonstrated the ongoing importance of both sovereignty and land to Māori.
4. That the Treaty of Waitangi was the main catalyst for change. The issues surrounding the existence of two differing versions of the Treaty and subsequent conflicting assertions of sovereignty made war inevitable. The Treaty led to land sales and increasing numbers of settlers, and established a government that took it upon itself to enact legislation such as the purchase of Wastelands. The Treaty led the government to make decisions that impacted upon Māori who did AND did not sign the document, which led to the formation of the Kingitanga.
5. That no one factor led the changes of the second half of the century, ie wars. Land, sovereignty, the Treaty, the Kingitanga, the conflict in Taranaki – they were all factors leading to the wars and to the significant changes that resulted from the wars. The Kingitanga contributed to the Wars, but it was not the primary catalyst.
6. That the Kingitanga was pivotal to change in the nineteenth century in that it was the beginning of Māori nationalism, which in itself led to significant change.

Candidates should give some idea of what they understand by "catalyst". They should identify what they believe the catalyst for change was and state the extent of their position, ie "to some extent", "to a great extent", "to a limited extent". They should establish the extent of the change that they believed resulted from the catalyst. They should look beyond the Wars.

Source A consists of one letter from Te Wherowhero to Queen Victoria in 1847 and the reply from the Colonial Office on behalf of the Queen. Te Wherowhero's letter establishes Māori concerns about Pākehā land hunger and growing land sales relatively soon after the Treaty was signed. It could be used to support the argument that land was the catalyst, ie the Sinclair argument that land was the real basis of conflict. This letter also demonstrates the continuation of Māori sovereignty in the decade after the Treaty was signed, and the idea that the authority of Māori

and the government of the Pākehā were in conflict with one another. The reply from the Colonial Office refers to “loyalty” and “duty” to the Queen, and establishes the idea that Pākehā believed they had attained sovereignty via the Treaty. This letter could be used to argue the case for sovereignty as a catalyst. Conflicting understandings of the Treaty are evident, contributing to the argument that the Treaty was the catalyst. The Treaty was a catalyst that led tribes who had not signed the Treaty to assert their sovereignty and their right to their land through war.

Source B shows that contemporaries viewed the Wars as being about land, not necessarily sovereignty, as the South Island settlers did not consider the Wars relative to the people’s concerns. Candidates could use the source to help them to identify the extent of the change that resulted from the wars, ie in the short term the Wars affected only the North Island, but in the long term the cost of the Wars had a significant impact on the developing Pākehā economy. Candidates might make note of the reference to the Wars as “Māori Wars” and argue that this contemporary view demonstrates that the wars were fought over sovereignty and, therefore, sovereignty was the main catalyst.

Source C1 establishes the argument that the Kingitanga was a catalyst for the establishment of Māori nationalism. This source could be used to argue the significance and strength of the Kingitanga as a movement and, therefore, as the catalyst of the Wars. It could also be used to argue that the formation of the Kingitanga was significant in determining the outcome of events in the latter half of the century because its existence perpetuated Māori autonomy. Source C2 reinforces the idea that there were two spheres in the latter part of the nineteenth century and that the Kingitanga was central to the perpetuation of a Māori sphere of influence.

Source D outlines the argument that the Kingitanga was established primarily as an anti-land selling league but also to unify Māori in the face of the problems symptomatic of European colonisation. It establishes that Governor Grey was not intimidated by the Kingitanga and, therefore, could be used to support the argument that the Kingitanga was not the main catalyst for change; for Pākehā sovereignty was more important. It could also be used to support the argument that for Māori, land was the main cause of change and, therefore, the catalyst. It demonstrates that the Kingitanga had a lasting impact and that it was a catalyst for on-going change in the latter half of the century.

Source E1 outlines Pākehā land hunger, assumptions of superiority; Pākehā decisions regarding Māori reserves demonstrate their continued assertion of sovereignty post-Treaty. This source could be used to argue that a number of causes were catalysts for war or that Pākehā assertions of sovereignty were the main causes. It should also be used to demonstrate that the Kingitanga and/or wars were only catalysts for significant change in the North Island and that the situation in the South Island was quite different. Pākehā land hunger was a catalyst that led to Vogel’s Plan, the opening up of land in the South Island in the 1890s, and it also led to the “swamping” of Māori by large Pākehā populations. Source E2 could be used to support the idea that significant change occurred in places outside of the areas where war occurred and, therefore, neither the Kingitanga nor the Wars should be cited as the major catalysts of change in the nineteenth century. These sources could be used to argue that the Treaty and Pākehā assertions of sovereignty were the most important catalysts.

Source F is a photo of members of Ngapuhi who resisted the imposition of the dog tax in the Hokianga in 1898. The cartoon in Source F also depicts Māori resistance to the dog tax and, therefore, Pākehā authority. These sources could be used to advance the argument that change took place in New Zealand aside from the Wars and with no connection to the Kingitanga. The source could be used to support the argument that other factors such as the Treaty or competing assertions of sovereignty were the catalysts for significant change that was ongoing until the end of the century. The Source could be used in comparison with Source A to show that tribes who did sign the Treaty (Source F), and those who did not (Source A), were equally challenged by and in turn challenged Pākehā assertions of sovereignty and, therefore, sovereignty was a more significant catalyst than the Kingitanga.

Source G demonstrates the growth in the Pākehā population due to increasing numbers of migrants and could be used to support the idea that increasing numbers of settlers increased land hunger, and the determination to gain access to Māori land and that land hunger and Pākehā interests were the catalysts of change in the second part of the century. It could also be used to suggest that the increasing numbers of Pākehā were anxious to gain more than “nominal” sovereignty over Māori. The decreasing Māori population could be used in relation to the extent of change in the second half of the century.

Source H could be used to argue that the Kingitanga was a significant catalyst for change as it led to war that divided Māori into sides, ie Queenites versus Kingites. It could also be used to suggest that the Kingitanga was not a major catalyst as Māori had always had tribal rivalries.

Source I exemplifies the idea that the Kingitanga was an important catalyst as it was the beginning of Māori nationalism. The source could also be used to argue that other catalysts such as the Treaty had a more significant impact on key developments in the second half of the century.

Source J demonstrates the desire for Pākehā to obtain sovereignty over Māori. It could be used to support the argument that sovereignty was the catalyst for change. The references to Wiremu Tamihana and his suggestion that Māori leaders should be admitted to the House of Representatives, and the request from the Aborigines

Protection Society for recognition of the Māori King, could be used to suggest that Pākehā fear of Māori sovereignty such as the Kingitanga made the Kingitanga a catalyst.

Source K shows the loss of Māori land in the second half of the century, demonstrating the significance of land as a catalyst for change. The map shows that land was alienated from Māori who had not participated in the Wars and that, therefore, land was a more significant catalyst than the Kingitanga; this could be tied to the Pākehā desire to progress in New Zealand at any cost. The map could also be used as an example of the degree of change that occurred after the conclusion of the Wars.

Source L is a cartoon (probably of Grey) “dreaming of peace and goodwill”. This could be used to support the argument that Pākehā assertions of sovereignty were the main cause of change.

Source M is written by Māori historian Danny Keenan. Candidates should use this source to show that the Pākehā government feared Māori sovereignty and took on the Kingitanga to establish their own sovereignty. It reinforces the Key Idea that the Pākehā government saw the Kingitanga as a political threat from their formation and that the Wars were a way of punishing the Māori for their opposition. It could be used to support the argument that the catalyst began with the Treaty.

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 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.

- The significance of evidence about particular areas (eg Scotland, Ireland and England) in discerning the extent to which events there created crisis. Also the significance of one person's (Engravings against Laudianism) as to how representative they were of widespread resentment at the Arminian Church; the significance of individual people (Laud, Wentworth, Buckingham) to argue the extent to which Charles was led “astray” or was the director of events and trends; the significance of one man in History.
- Continuity and change – Were there dramatic changes during Personal Rule that led to a great gulf between the King and the governing class, as some historians in the past have suggested, or was Personal Rule a time of peace and stability, as Sharpe suggests; or were there long-term factors that made governing multiple Kingdoms increasingly difficult?
- Patterns and trends – Was the legacy of Elizabeth and James such that Charles was forced to take unpopular directions to “make ends meet”? Was the archaic state a “failed state” before Charles? Students should demonstrate their knowledge of the nature of the archaic state as well as how well Elizabeth and James faced issues to discuss the extent to which Charles's rule represented a real break with the past.
- Cause and effect – The relative importance of events 1640–42 in bringing about civil war – immediate causes over long-term causes; the success of Charles in creating a royalist party (Cust) suggests that criticism about his inability to rule are unfounded.

- Past and present – how much should historians today use psychological descriptions to judge people in the past? The notion of a “failed state” that faced Charles is a present-day term to describe states in which legitimate authority has been eroded, or where a government is so weak or ineffective that it has little effective control over much of its territory, are not capable of fulfilling the basic conditions and responsibilities of a sovereign state. Is this an appropriate term for early modern England? If it applies to Charles’s reign, does it also apply to Elizabeth’s and James’s?

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

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

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

- The increase in the number of Pākehā led to land hunger and conflict between the two races over land. The land deals conducted by the New Zealand Company led to conflict between Māori and Pākehā, eg the Waitara dispute.
- The aspirations of migrants in New Zealand led to expectations of political autonomy. The growth in the number of settlers in Auckland following the establishment of the capital led to Pākehā interest in the fertile land of the Waikato.
- Experience of challenges to mana Māori and exposure to new forms of government fostered Māori nationalism. Wiremu Tamihana began to talk of the idea of a Māori King as soon as Pākehā began to discuss the possibility of self-government.
- The changing experience for Māori after the Treaty, eg the Maketu Incident of 1842, the waiving of pre-emption, the prohibition of kauri felling, the alienation of wasteland. This led to the discussion of the intent of the Treaty at Kohimarama in 1860.
- Presentism has influenced the writing of historians on the nineteenth-century experience.
- Conflicting assertions of sovereignty led to war and then law, eg the Waitara dispute, the establishment of the Kingitanga, the Māori Representation Act, the Native Settlements Act, the Native Schools Act.
- Māori tribal affiliations changed because of the emergence of the Kingitanga, eg Queenites vs Kingitanga.

### **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. In order for the candidate to reach this category, these judgements would need to show an insightful understanding about the nature of the issue or perspective of the historian / contemporary.
3. A candidate will be deemed to have *evaluated historical narratives* if he or she has correctly and accurately used the views of historians and/or contemporaries in his/her argument and has made some simple judgements about the validity of these views. This would include using the views of one historian / contemporary to evaluate another. A candidate would have to make several of these simple judgments in order to gain a mark of 4 (or have fewer but stronger evaluative points).
4. A candidate who gains either 2 marks (at least one genuine attempt) or 1 mark (a glimmer!) has to have attempted to make an evaluative comment about the views of historians and/or contemporaries concerning the historical issue.

**Content possibilities (England)**

The Scholarship candidate might:

- comment on and discuss the different historians' interpretations about the nature of Charles's rule and his character and ability – Cust; Russell; Sharpe
- comment on the post-revisionist views of Cust
- recognise the weaknesses in the arguments of those past historians who have described personal rule as Eleven Years of tyranny and recognise the conflicting evidence on the level of discontent during the 1630s. Students should be able to recognise why "revisionist" and post-revisionist ideas have emerged and connect their discussion to the changing methodology of historians
- mention the contrasting views of other historians' views as part of their arguments, eg John Morrill, John Adamson, Ann Hughes
- place the narratives of the contemporaries in the context of the time – eg Wenceslaus Hollar
- include discussion of views of contemporaries / narratives not referred to in the sources – such as and many others in relation to their argument
- be prepared to challenge sources that do not sit well with evidence that the candidate brings into the examination.

Note that when citing historians' views, candidates need to link those view(s) to their argument about the extent to which Charles I was pivotal to the outbreak of civil war.



**Content possibilities (New Zealand)**

The Scholarship candidate might:

- refer to Keith Sinclair's argument that antagonism existed between Māori and Pākehā that was an inevitable catalyst for conflict and that Māori nationalism grew out of the fear of land loss, and Māori self-determination
- refer to the Ranginui Walker argument that the Wars occurred because the Pākehā government wanted to "topple" the King and get access to the fertile lands of the Waikato
- refer to the Belich argument that there was no one cause of war and that the Governors of the time saw the Kingitanga as a threat to their ability to assert their sovereignty and to acquire enough land in order to get on with the business of developing a successful colony
- refer to the Daniel Keenan idea that the Wars were about land because to Māori, land and sovereignty are inextricably linked; the Kingitanga was established to protect land, hence sovereignty
- refer to the idea of Sorrenson that the Kingitanga was an anti-land-selling confederation and the Wars were about land.
- refer to the orthodox view of James Cowan that the Kingitanga was a threat to Pākehā and, therefore, war was necessary
- contrast the views of Sinclair, Sorrenson, and Walker.

Note that when citing historians' views, candidates need to link those view(s) to their argument about the extent to which the formation of the Kingitanga was pivotal to change.

**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 regional variations in the decision of which side to support; the rule and legacy of Elizabeth and James; the role of Henrietta Maria; the impact of the defeat in the Bishops War; Charles's religious beliefs; the record of Wentworth in Ireland; the failure of Charles's parliaments 1625–29; controversy over Ship Money; the role of Parliamentary leaders such as Pym in bringing about conflict

- discuss the nature of evidence. For example, Sources B and M – specific comments about the nature of paintings/portraits – who were these for? Was the message in them disseminated widely or only to a very small part of the governing class? What sort of people wrote them and why? Sources E1 and E2, I and L2 are engravings – how reliable are these for an historian since they lack specific aspects about their authors? What purpose did they have? How widespread were the views presented in them? How far do they reflect religious divisions of the time? Source B – a portrait – how useful/limited is it in telling us about the nature of Charles's rule/personal rule? Source F – how reliable can a nineteenth-century painting be of an event in 1642? What does it suggest about the painter's views of this event? Who was the painter? Source I – tables of statistics of population and price rises – what statistics are missing which might add to the picture of long-term factors economic difficulties? How accurate are statistics from this period? Were there regional differences? What impact did these have on the growing conflict?
- comment on the lack of sources covering royalist propaganda; absence of diaries and personal reminiscences
- evaluate Clarendon's view of Charles (Source A2) that suggests that Charles was not responsible for the civil war and that Charles lacked self-confidence – candidates must be able to draw on their own knowledge of Clarendon as a participant on the side of the royalists and not just rely on the given
- comment on the representativeness, usefulness and reliability of these sources as evidence; the limitations of some of these sources relative to others; the comment that can be made on the limitations of single pieces of evidence about the tables of statistics; how the note from the Privy Council meeting in which Wentworth is alleged to have suggested the use of the Irish army; the list of Buckingham's titles.

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

The Scholarship candidate might:

- comment on the need for more specific evidence from the source selection including statistics on land loss, Kingitanga territorial locations, contemporary accounts of the effect of the Wars, and views of Pākehā settlers
- discuss the nature of evidence. For example: What is the purpose of the dog tax cartoon in Source F? Why was the photo in F taken? What were the circumstances surrounding the photograph? How representative is the photo in Source H of how many kupapa there were? How representative is Mair's experience? What statistics are missing in Sources G and K? How were the data in Source G collected?
- comment on the need for more information about the nature of the photographs
- comment on the lack of sources covering settlers' perspectives and political debates over the Kingitanga, as well as contemporary accounts of Kingitanga
- comment on the representativeness, usefulness, and reliability of these sources as evidence. What comments on the limitations of a single piece of evidence can be made about the letter in Source A and the newspaper article in Source E2?
- comment on the need for more information about the response of the Pākehā government to the Kingitanga
- comment on the bias of Māori historians such as Walker and Keenan
- comment on the unreliability of statistics on Māori as in Source G. Māori data were not included in any census until late in the century. Revisionist historians might argue that Pākehā governments may have manipulated data to support their assimilation policies
- comment on the need for more information about which tribes did or did not sign the Treaty.

## 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 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 to which they agree or disagree with the notion, it is important that candidates add their own knowledge so that coverage is broad, deep and balanced. These are both questions that cover an extended period of time and have allowed for candidates to keep that in mind when constructing their argument – how much weight they give to one argument at a point in time compared with its relevance at a later point.

### **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 2009

### 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***Argument (Skill No. 1)**

*Respond to the view expressed in the key idea and communicate your own substantiated argument concerning the extent to which Charles I was the catalyst for change in Early Modern England / the extent to which the formation of the Kingitanga was a catalyst for change in nineteenth century New Zealand.*

- effectively communicate sophisticated, substantiated argument. PD1 (8 or 7)
- effectively communicate substantiated argument. PD2 (6 or 5)
- communicate an argument. PD3 (4)
- attempt to communicate an argument. PD4 (2)

**Evaluating Historical Narratives (Skill No. 3)**

*Evaluate historians' interpretations and the views of contemporaries that relate to this historical issue.*

- critically evaluate historical narratives (sustained). PD1 (8)
- critically evaluate historical narratives. PD2 (6)
- evaluate historical narratives. PD3 (4 or 3)
- attempt to evaluate historical narratives. PD4 (2 or 1)

**Historical Relationships (Skill 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)
- demonstrate an informed understanding of historical relationships in selected contexts and settings. PD2 (6 or 5)
- demonstrate an understanding of historical relationships in selected contexts and settings. PD3 (4)
- attempt to demonstrate an understanding of historical relationships in selected contexts and settings. PD4 (2 or 1)

**Judgements about Evidence/Research (Skill 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 or 7)
- make informed judgements about the nature of historical evidence and / or historical research. PD2 (6 or 5)
- make valid judgements about the nature of historical evidence and / or research. PD3 (4 or 3)
- attempt to make valid judgements about the nature of historical evidence and / or research. PD4 (2 or 1)

**Synthesis of Ideas (Skill 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)
- synthesise ideas relevant to the historical context(s) and setting(s). PD2 (6 or 5)
- identify ideas relevant to the historical contexts and settings. PD3 (4 or 3)
- attempt to identify ideas relevant to the historical contexts and settings. PD4 (2 or 1)

**Understanding of question/context (Skill 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)
- 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