

## NEW ZEALAND SCHOLARSHIP 2004

### ASSESSMENT SCHEDULE FOR HISTORY

#### Topic One: England 1558–1667

##### Assessment Schedule for Performance Descriptor 2

**Clearly defines the scope and focus of the task.**

The candidate at this level will show a clear understanding of the task requirements. He/she will show that he/she is familiar with the changing nature of the debate on the abilities of both Elizabeth I and James I and will bring evidence from his/her own knowledge, as well as the resources, to support his/her own argument on the abilities and effectiveness of both monarchs.

Candidates will need to:

1. respond to the view expressed in the quotation, and establish his/her own argument concerning the abilities and effectiveness of both monarchs *communication and argument*
2. support his/her argument with relevant and accurate historical information *use of historical information*
3. *evaluate the evidence available to historians historians evidence*
4. evaluate historians' interpretations of the abilities and effectiveness of both monarchs *historians interpretations*
5. establish his/her own reasoned conclusions about the abilities and effectiveness of both monarchs *reaching conclusions*
6. follow an appropriate historical format, with a clear introduction, a series of sequentially-presented paragraphs and a reasoned conclusion. *structure*

**Communicate an historical argument that is substantiated by the use of accurate historical evidence.**

- A candidate at this level will be able to advance clearly, fluently and logically his/her own argument about the abilities and effectiveness of both Elizabeth I and James I. A candidate who argues that Elizabeth had a wide range of abilities and was the more effective of the two monarchs would be expected to draw on and develop the arguments presented in Sources B and C, and show a clear understanding of the visual in Source E relating to Elizabeth. Such a candidate would also be expected to show an understanding of Source D. This candidate would also be expected to negate some of the arguments contained in Sources A, G and I. Any such argument would have to be supported by detailed, accurate and relevant information from the candidate's own knowledge.
- A candidate who argues that James was the more effective ruler would be expected to expand on Sources G and I, while logically negating the arguments contained in Sources F and J. Reference would need to be made to Source H, and James's emphasis on divine right. This candidate would also be expected to be able to counter the idea of Elizabeth's greatness.
- It is possible that a student might wish to advance an argument in which both are seen to have their abilities and to be effective rulers within specific time frames of each reign. This is acceptable, so long as clear explanations of why this occurred are provided.

**Refers to at least EIGHT of the sources provided, links those sources to the historical argument, shows an awareness of historical interpretations, and shows an understanding of the nature of historical evidence.**

The candidate at this level will refer to at least EIGHT of the sources provided. These sources should be linked to the argument provided by the candidate.

This could include recognition of:

- bias within some of the sources
- limitations of some evidence
- appropriateness of the selection of sources
- reliability of the sources
- changes over time in the research process
- the weighing-up of evidence.

The candidate at this level might:

- comment on the need for more specific evidence from the source selection; eg specific details about foreign policy, or Crown/parliament debates
- discuss the nature of evidence; eg the Weldon source is acknowledged as being written by a man resentful of James and who disliked Scots, the clear bias shown in the visual relating to Elizabeth, and why such bias occurred
- comment in particular about the 'revisionist' nature of history writing, with particular reference to James I.

### **Shows understanding of some historical relationships.**

The Performance Descriptor 2 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, patterns and trends. This awareness could be illustrated by reference to some of the sources, eg, C, D, G, or it could develop from the candidate's own knowledge, eg James's pacific foreign policy in part sprang from his chronic shortage of necessary funding.

### **Appropriate structure, format, and proper use of historical conventions.**

Candidates at this level are expected to express their ideas fluently, logically and succinctly, in a style appropriate for an article. Their work must show an appropriate historical format, with a clear introduction, a series of sequentially presented paragraphs, and a sophisticated conclusion where all points of the argument are drawn together into a coherent whole.

Language is to be appropriate, with accurate grammar, spelling and punctuation.

The use of appropriate historical conventions, such as names, dates and references, is expected.

### **Assessment Schedule for Outstanding Performance - Performance Descriptor 1**

Outstanding Performance - Performance Descriptor 1 candidates will be those who think 'outside the square', who have a complex and original understanding and appreciation of the topic. The ideas in their article will be sophisticated and perceptive.

They will:

- effectively communicate sophisticated, substantiated argument *communication and argument*
- develop informed and perceptive judgements about the nature of historical evidence and/or historical research *use of historical information*
- critically evaluate historical narratives
- demonstrate a thorough and perceptive understanding of historical relationships in the context of the debate over the abilities and effectiveness of Elizabeth I and James I
- synthesise, with perception and insight, ideas relevant to the topic
- demonstrate an understanding of the critical underpinnings and scope of the topic.

### **Assessment Schedule for Performance Descriptor 3**

Refer to the History Performance Standard

Candidates at Performance Descriptor 3 will:

- communicate an argument.
- make valid judgements about the nature of historical evidence and/or research.
- evaluate historical narratives.
- demonstrate an understanding of historical relationships in selected contexts and questions.
- identify ideas relevant to the historical contexts and settings.
- demonstrate some understanding of the scope of an historical question/context.

### **Assessment Schedule for Performance Descriptor 4**

Refer to the History Performance Standard

The candidate will:

- communicate an argument.
- attempt to make valid judgements about the nature of historical evidence and/or research.
- attempt to evaluate historical narratives.
- attempt to demonstrate an understanding of historical relationships in selected contexts and questions.
- attempt to identify ideas relevant to the historical contexts and settings.
- attempt to demonstrate some understanding of the scope of an historical question/context.

## **Topic Two: New Zealand in the Nineteenth Century**

### **Assessment Schedule for Performance Descriptor 2**

**Clearly defines the scope and focus of the task.**

The candidate at this level will show a clear understanding of the task requirements. He/she will show that he/she is familiar with the atomisation/community debate and bring evidence from his/her own knowledge, as well as the sources provided to support his/her argument.

Candidates will need to:

1. respond to the view expressed in the quotation, and establish his/her own argument concerning the nature of Pākehā community in nineteenth-century New Zealand
2. support his/her argument with relevant and accurate historical information
3. evaluate the evidence available to historians
4. evaluate historians' interpretations of Pākehā community in the nineteenth century
5. establish his/her own reasoned conclusions about the nature of Pākehā community in nineteenth-century New Zealand
6. follow an appropriate historical format, with a clear introduction, a series of sequentially-presented paragraphs and a reasoned conclusion.

**Communicate an historical argument that is substantiated by the use of accurate historical evidence.**

- The candidate at this level will be able to advance clearly, fluently and logically her/his own argument in favour of the atomisation thesis, against it, or make an argument (possibly drawing on Source J) that presents some sort of third way.
- A Performance Descriptor 2 candidate arguing in favour of atomisation will be able to describe the causes and consequences of atomisation that Fairburn outlines and draw on evidence from Fairburn himself (both Sources A and B), national statistics about sex ratios and his/her own knowledge. He/she will also have to deal to the counter arguments contained in the resources, possibly dismissing them as being too specific (Sources G and H), too general (Source F) and lacking in substantial evidence (Source C).
- A candidate arguing against the atomisation thesis could point out the importance of regional statistics and draw on evidence from Sources G, H and I. They might point out the importance of women (as agents of settlement), families and Māori to New Zealand society.

**Refers to at least EIGHT of the sources provided, links those sources to the historical argument, shows awareness of historical interpretations, and shows an understanding of the nature of historical evidence.**

The candidate will refer to at least EIGHT of the sources provided. These sources should be linked to the argument presented by the candidate.

This could include recognition of:

- bias within some of the sources
- limitations of some evidence
- appropriateness of the selection of sources
- reliability of the sources
- changes over time in the research process
- the weighing-up of evidence.

The candidate at this level might:

- comment on the need for more evidence for atomisation from the source selection provided. Fairburn provides plenty of statistics which he claims point to unsettlement. Many of these concern violence, litigiousness and binge drinking.
- comment that many of the criticisms of atomisation provided in the resources (especially Mackay and Daley) are too specific to undercut Fairburn's broad thesis. Conversely, Phillips and Oliver (his article pre-dates Fairburn's book) might be seen to be too reliant on anecdotal generalisation.
- discuss the nature of evidence. Historical records are often biased in the way that they reflect the history of those who stay put. As Belich has said, there is a 'tendency of community history to exaggerate its own lumping power – myths of cohesion in the past encourage actual cohesion in the present'.
- draw on the Australian example or those of other frontier societies and explain that the New Zealand situation is much less remarkable than Fairburn has argued.
- use Source B as a case study supporting the argument for atomisation or use Source I, which provides plenty of evidence against atomisation and the impact of chain migration and the predominance of family groups in migration to New Zealand in the 1870s.
- point out that Fairburn simply ignores the 1840s – a period that could be seen as crucial to the formation of community.
- discuss the relative strengths and weaknesses of oral history and literary evidence over statistical evidence.

### **Shows understanding of some historical relationships.**

The candidate at this level 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, pattern and trends. All these historical relationships are apparent in this debate.

- A Performance Descriptor 2 candidate might make the connection between migration and atomisation or chain migration with community.
- There is ample scope for discussion about the relationship of 'specific and general', regarding the Kauri Bushmen, residents of Taradale, and the case studies in relation to the creation of a national picture of community or lack of it.
- The analysis of statistics provides plenty of scope for discussing the significance of regional and urban statistics compared to national statistics in this argument.
- The candidate at this level may well ask if transience necessarily equates to atomisation.

### **Appropriate structure, format and proper use of historical conventions.**

Performance Descriptor 2 candidates are expected to express their ideas fluently, logically and succinctly, in a style appropriate for an article. Their work must show an appropriate historical format, with a clear introduction, a series of sequentially presented paragraphs, and a sophisticated conclusion where all points of the argument are drawn together in a coherent whole.

Language is to be appropriate, with accurate grammar, spelling and punctuation.

The use of appropriate historical conventions, such as names, dates and references, is expected.

### **Assessment Schedule for Outstanding Performance - Performance Descriptor 1**

Outstanding Performance - Performance Descriptor 1 candidates will be those who think 'outside the square', who have a complex and original understanding and appreciation of the topic.

The ideas in their article will be both sophisticated and perceptive.

They will:

- effectively communicate sophisticated, substantiated argument
- develop informed and perceptive judgements about the nature of historical evidence and/or historical research
- critically evaluate historical narratives
- demonstrate a thorough and perceptive understanding of historical relationships in the context of the atomisation debate
- synthesise, with perception and insight, ideas relevant to the topic
- demonstrate an understanding of the critical underpinnings and scope of the topic.

### **Assessment Schedule for Performance Descriptor 3**

Refer to the History Performance Standard

Candidates at Performance Descriptor 3 will:

- communicate an argument.
- make valid judgements about the nature of historical evidence and/or research.
- evaluate historical narratives.
- demonstrate an understanding of historical relationships in selected contexts and questions.
- identify ideas relevant to the historical contexts and settings.
- demonstrate some understanding of the scope of an historical question/context.

**Assessment Schedule for Performance Descriptor 4**

Refer to the History Performance Standard

The candidate will:

- communicate an argument.
- attempt to make valid judgements about the nature of historical evidence and/or research.
- attempt to evaluate historical narratives.
- attempt to demonstrate an understanding of historical relationships in selected contexts and questions.
- attempt to identify ideas relevant to the historical contexts and settings.
- attempt to demonstrate some understanding of the scope of an historical question/context.