

Assessment Schedule – 2024

Scholarship History (93403)

The candidate answers THREE questions. Each response is marked out of 8 against the descriptors for the History Scholarship Standard.

Schedule 1: Criteria for Question One

Outstanding Scholarship	7 - Addresses the question directly, demonstrating a thorough understanding of its scope. - Constructs a convincing argument, well supported by a range of evidence and own knowledge. - Evaluates the source material in an insightful manner. - Demonstrates a high level of understanding of historical narratives and evaluation of historical evidence. - Provides a thoughtful discussion of how reliability and usefulness can be determined.	8 - Addresses the question directly, demonstrating a thorough and informed understanding of its scope. - Constructs a substantiated argument, integrating a wide range of evidence from sources, and the candidate's own understanding and knowledge of historical narratives insightfully and coherently. - Includes perceptive and sophisticated evaluation of evidence from several sources, including an understanding of the possible limitations of historical evidence. - Provides an informed discussion of how reliability and usefulness can be determined.
Scholarship	5 - Responds to the question in a concise and clear manner. - Constructs an argument supported by the source material and own knowledge. - Shows a limited but effective awareness of other historical narratives. - Demonstrates an ability to evaluate the source material.	6 - Addresses the question concisely and consistently. - Constructs a substantiated argument drawing on a range of sources and own knowledge. - Demonstrates an awareness of other historical narratives, adding a degree of complexity to the answer. - Makes valid judgements about several of the sources.
Below Scholarship	3 - Attempts to develop an argument but does not address the question. - Demonstrates some understanding of historical narratives. - Ignores the question but demonstrates a detailed understanding of historical narratives. - Compares / contrasts the sources as a way of attempting to support the resulting argument. - Provides a judgement about the way in which historians agree / disagree. - Makes a valid judgement of historical evidence, though any conclusion is limited and superficial. - Constructs an argument based on generalities and with a limited engagement with the source material.	4 - Attempts to respond to the question but lacks a consistent argument. - Supports the argument with appropriate examples. - Makes at least one valid and detailed judgement as to the usefulness / limitation / reliability of the sources. - Includes the integration of their own knowledge of historical narratives. - Shows a limited understanding of the ideas underpinning historical narratives. - Relies on prior knowledge which lessens the effectiveness of the candidate's argument.
	1 - Does not address the question. - Shows little understanding of historical narratives.	2 - Attempts to answer the question in a limited and perfunctory way. - Comments on the sources by comparing one source with another, or evaluates the sources in a superficial way. - Shows limited understanding of historical narratives.

Examples of possible approaches to Question One

Using Sources A–J, to what extent do the differing historical narratives of Te Tiriti o Waitangi – the Treaty of Waitangi (1840) reflect its continuing relevance?

Evidence

The candidate could focus on the important word in the question, “continuing”, allowing them to argue that:

- for Māori, Te Tiriti o Waitangi (1840), is relevant because of its continuing importance
- for many Pākehā, this same Treaty, had little or no importance – it was a “nullity”, and as such, was seen as irrelevant, or as an impediment to their particular interests
- the Treaty has become of even more relevance in recent years and is not just about “continuing”
- the various reasons why the Treaty has “continuing relevance” is because of the differing interpretations of the Treaty, arising from the translations of the original document
- relevancy suggests importance and, by focusing on some of the ways that the Treaty is important, could establish its relevancy (although candidates need to be aware that “relevance” is qualified by “continuing” – it is not enough to discuss the relevancy of the Treaty without acknowledging this qualifier).

This is a topic that candidates should be very familiar with, but not all historians and issues connected to this topic are included in the source material. Mention of some of these could allow candidates to make pertinent and insightful comments, which would reflect a clear and comprehensive knowledge of this topic. Many important events of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries are not mentioned in the source material, but a discussion of these events would contribute to an argument based on the notion that, for Māori at least, the Treaty has continued to have relevance from 1840 onwards.

Ideas from the sources could include:

Source A1: The image of the New Zealand coat of arms should attract some scrutiny, as many candidates will be familiar with it but not many will have examined it closely. The candidate could argue that the ideas of continuing relevancy are reflected in this image. Ideas of the Treaty being or not being a partnership between two peoples could be contested using this source.

Source A2: Carwyn Jones suggests relevancy in this brief excerpt. The candidate could note that, in a succinct manner, the importance of the Treaty is confirmed. Relevancy is also suggested in the description of the Treaty as “a political tool”. The candidate could also make connections between this description and contemporary political arguments.

Source B: M. P. K. Sorrenson enables the candidate to use this source to argue that the Treaty can be discussed within a wider historical context and that the use of the language of the Indigenous people makes this document a relative rarity, thus increasing its importance and relevancy.

Source C: Ruth Ross could encourage the candidate to argue that her question as to how many Māori or Pākehā ever take notice of the Treaty has been overtaken by recent events. She argues that the signatories of 1840 were “uncertain” about its meaning. However, her statements about the ambiguous and contradictory characteristics of the Treaty could be used to support an argument about its ongoing relevancy.

Source D: James Belich’s references to Prendergast’s ruling and, more recently, Simich’s description of the Treaty, could be used by the candidate to argue that though the Treaty may have had little relevancy to many Pākehā, this has not been the case for Māori. This could give the candidate an opportunity to discuss events in the nineteenth century that, from a Māori perspective, refute Prendergast’s claim.

Source E: William Renwick argues that for most Pākehā, the Treaty has been an irrelevancy, but in more recent times, there has been a re-evaluation of the Treaty, and its place in the lives of all New Zealanders. The candidate could note that Renwick’s argument is contrary to the opinion of Ruth Ross, whose view of the Treaty as being our “Magna Carta”, is one she ridicules.

Source F: The extract by Matthew Wright could allow the candidate to argue that the Treaty has not had relevancy for Pākehā. Its neglect, after being consigned to a basement, is a clear refutation of any argument that the Treaty had relevance or importance.

Source G: Vincent O’Malley, Bruce Stirling, and Wally Penetito (Eds.) confirm the importance of the Treaty to Māori some 20 years after the signing of the document. What may have been a “nullity” to the Chief Justice in 1877, clearly had importance to Māori as they gathered at Kohimarama. Its relevancy is highlighted in the willingness of the assembled chiefs to disrupt the agenda of Governor Browne and focus their attention on this document. And again, the candidate could use this source to show Māori continued from 1840 to fight for its significance, in relation to the founding principles of our nation.

Source H: Ranginui Walker may encourage the more cynical candidate to argue that the Treaty had relevancy only when it suited the government of the day. They could also argue that, as protests from Māori grew, there was a belated move from officialdom to give attention to the Treaty and move it further into the centre of the nation's attention. The candidate could also note that this is a perspective from another Māori historian, and as such, is a voice that has been missing from most of the source material.

Source I1: Apirana Ngata appears to support the prevailing interpretation of the Treaty as an agreement in which sovereignty had passed to the Crown in this extract from a text first published in 1922. Its purpose was to explain the Treaty and the ideas and principles underpinning it. The candidate might question why the organisation that published and distributed this text went to such expense to publicise Ngata's opinion. That this document was published in 2024 does at least support the argument that the Treaty has continuing relevance.

Source I2: Apirana Ngata, in this speech given to the House of Representatives in 1939, shows that he no longer supports the opinion he held in 1922. Perspectives can change, and the willingness of Ngata to reconsider what he once held to be true, reflects the ongoing debate and discussion around the Treaty and its implications. The candidate might question why Ngata's change of mind was not recognised by the organisation that had gone to the expense and trouble to distribute his original remarks without this qualification.

Source I3: Jock Phillips shows that the opportunity to celebrate the centennial of the signing of the Treaty was used by many Pākehā to focus on a nationhood that effectively excluded Māori. The candidate could use this source to demonstrate that the Treaty was, for an extended period, ignored by mainstream Pākehā. The candidate could note the further claims by Ngata that whatever promises were made in the Treaty, they have not benefitted Māori.

Source J: Christopher Finlayson's and James Christmas's suggestion that the Treaty has a relevance for both parties and that, through tolerance and mutual respect, continuing discussions and debates will result in "... building a country based on fairness, tolerance, and respect ..." could be useful for the candidate.

In responding to the question, candidates need to not only use the source material to support their argument but also evaluate several of the sources. There are contrasting ideas that can be compared, historians who are missing, and whose authoritative voice might have made a valuable contribution to the argument, and degrees of usefulness to be assessed. And of course, candidates must be able to bring their own knowledge and understanding of the Treaty to inform and support their argument.

Schedule 2: Criteria for Question Two

Outstanding Scholarship	7 • Constructs a clear and developed answer that addresses the question, written authoritatively and authentically. • Argues convincingly the importance of historical relationships in understanding key concepts. • Analyses a range of historical relationships, demonstrating an authentic understanding of their importance. • Evaluates a range of historical relationships in an informed manner.	8 • Constructs a clear and developed answer that addresses the question, written authoritatively and convincingly. • Argues perceptively the importance of historical relationships in understanding key concepts. • Analyses insightfully a range of historical relationships. • Evaluates a range of historical relationships in an informed and convincing manner.
Scholarship	5 • Responds to the question in a concise and clear manner. • Constructs an argument supported by source material, which is not consistently coherent. • Shows less understanding of the importance / complexity of historical relationships. • Does not use knowledge of historical relationships in other contexts effectively.	6 • Responds with a clear and developed answer that addresses the question. • Shows an understanding of the importance / complexity of historical relationships and the way in which they enable a historian to understand how the significance of past events can change over time. • Constructs a clear and coherent argument explaining how the sources are interconnected and how there is a range of historical relationships. • Uses a range of sources to support the argument. • Demonstrates a knowledge of historical relationships in another historical context.
Below Scholarship	3 • Addresses the question but relies on a source-by-source analysis as a substitute for an argument. • Attempts to establish the importance of historical relationships. • Attempts to identify and integrate examples from the sources. • Identifies a historical relationship and other examples in one source but fails to successfully link any such historical relationship to the question. • Engages with the sources but without identifying how they allow an understanding of the importance of the historical event.	4 • Addresses the question clearly but not always consistently. • Establishes the importance of historical relationships. • Integrates examples from the sources into an argument. • Identifies historical relationships in one or two sources. • Engages with the sources without consistently demonstrating the relationship between the source material and the question. • Identifies and incorporates examples from the sources in an argument and attempts to explain their importance.
	1 • Provides a very limited and brief response. • Shows little evidence of any understanding of the scope of the question. • Attempts to identify a historical relationship but does not demonstrate any understanding of how it relates to the event.	2 • Attempts a response but fails to address the question. • Makes simple points without evidence from the sources. • Identifies a historical relationship with a limited understanding of its importance, or identifies more than one historical relationship but fails to explain its purpose. • Identifies historical relationships implicitly.

Examples of possible approaches to Question Two

To what extent do the historical relationships in Sources K–T enable historians to understand the significant impact of treaties on the Indigenous peoples of North America?

Evidence

The candidate, in analysing the different historical relationships in the source material, needs to focus on the key word in the question, “significant”, and use this in their argument. The impact of treaties on Indigenous peoples in North America could be analysed as being:

- temporal, economic, political, cultural, and geographic
- able to be measured through a range of historical relationships, such as past and present, change and continuity, differing perspectives, general and specific, and emerging patterns and trends
- linked to the causes of events, discussed both explicitly and implicitly in the source material.

Candidates need to be aware that in dealing with these different relationships, they must identify each element. It is not enough to discuss the characteristics of these impacts in the present, without acknowledging those in the past. In analysing the impact of events, mention must be made of the cause.

Ideas from the sources could include:

Source K: Marcia Langton, Maureen Tehan, Lisa Palmer, and Kathryn Shain (Eds.) establish the importance of treaties through a description of the reasons for treaties between other peoples of North America and the incoming Europeans. These reasons could be used by candidates to help identify the causes of various treaties, such as in the specific example in Source L.

Source L: The Independence Hall and Angie Debo show that a treaty was dictated suggesting that the cause of this treaty was to further the interests of the newly created United States. The candidate could note that the impact of this treaty was significant if measured by the loss of land. The long-term effect of this treaty was the emergence of the state of Ohio. A possible cause of the treaty could be identified as a desire to transfer land to arriving settlers, and so meeting the need of increased migration, and resulting in the emerging dominance of European settlers.

Source M: David Lewis develops an argument that these treaties were used to allow increased settlement by incoming Europeans – that the impact of these treaties was not just on the Indigenous peoples – but on settlers as well. The candidate could argue that treaties had significant negative impacts on one group and significant benefits for another.

Source N: Treatiesmatter.org describes other treaties with similar characteristics to those in other source material. The candidate could argue that these patterns of broken promises, displacement of peoples, and war helped establish an emerging trend – a trend which was to be a continuing characteristic over an extended period.

Source O: Abraham Lincoln’s annual message to Congress in 1863 suggests that an underlying cause of these treaties was to not just access the land desired by settlers, but to justify these treaties by invoking the Christian God and the ‘benefits’ of ‘civilisation’. The candidate familiar with nineteenth-century North American history could discuss the notion of ‘manifest destiny’ and the way it was used to promote migration into and across the lands of Indigenous peoples.

Source P1: History.com describes a specific battle and several specific individuals. The candidate could argue that this source could allow a historian to further understand the consequences of dishonoured treaties and how these led to conflict between Indigenous peoples and the government.

Source P2: The image is a poster advertising one of the films that attempted to romanticise “Custer’s Last Stand”.

Source Q: Kimbra Cutlip details treaties that were ignored or broken. The source is taken from the Smithsonian Institute’s website and candidates could use this source to show how over time attitudes have changed – an exhibition illustrating the different treaties – how the ruling of the Supreme Court is an impact of the broken promises of treaties, and the specific mention of an individual, Chief John Spotted Tail, who like so many is working to right the wrongs of the past.

Source R: The Red Road describes a significant consequence of these treaties – the failure of the education system designed to cater for the needs of Indigenous peoples. This source suggests that the failure to achieve ‘proficiency’ was because of an unwillingness of the US government to deliver on the promises made in a treaty. Past failures in the education system continue into the present.

Sources S and T: Neil Philip and the Native American Rights Fund describe significant outcomes of the treaty system – the establishment of casinos on land controlled by Indigenous peoples, and the cancellation of the Keystone pipeline. The candidate could identify and explain that these are examples of the changing economic and political effects of treaties. They could also argue the altered status of Indigenous peoples; growing economic power and the assertion of the sovereignty they once enjoyed.

Schedule 3: Criteria for Question Three

Outstanding Scholarship	7 • Addresses the question by acknowledging its complexities in a clear and concise manner. • Constructs a persuasive and perceptive argument. • Constructs an argument that engages with the historical context in a confident manner. • Connects the source material to the historical context and key ideas in an informed manner. • Demonstrates a high level of critical thinking. • Arrives at an insightful conclusion.	8 • Addresses the question by acknowledging its complexities in a convincing manner. • Constructs an argument that is assured and perceptive. • Constructs an argument that engages with the historical context in an authoritative and confident manner. • Connects the source material to the historical context and key ideas in an informed and authoritative manner. • Demonstrates a high level of critical thinking. • Arrives at an insightful and persuasive conclusion.
Scholarship	5 • Addresses the question in a clear and concise manner. • Constructs an argument that demonstrates an informed understanding of the historical context. • Constructs an argument that shows an ability to evaluate and analyse the key ideas in the topic. • Integrates the source material in a convincing and informed manner.	6 • Addresses the question in a clear and concise manner. • Constructs an argument that demonstrates an informed understanding and knowledge of the historical context. • Constructs an argument that shows an ability to thoughtfully evaluate and analyse the key ideas in the topic. • Integrates the source material in a coherent and convincing manner.
Below Scholarship	3 • Attempts to respond to the question but does not show a broad understanding and knowledge of the context. • Attempts to construct an argument but this is limited in its effectiveness. • Uses several sources to support an argument but does not develop a connection to the historical context and / or key ideas.	4 • Addresses the question and attempts to respond to its scope and intent. • Constructs an argument that relies on the source material, limiting its effectiveness. • Integrates the source material successfully but with limited reference to the relationship between the sources and the question. • Provides a well-written response but does not demonstrate a sound knowledge of the historical context and / or key ideas.
	1 • Constructs a very limited and brief response. • Demonstrates little evidence of any understanding of the scope of the question. • Demonstrates little evidence of any understanding of the historical context.	2 • Attempts to address the question but without providing evidence to suggest any knowledge / understanding of the context. • Does not demonstrate an ability to write at length. • Attempts to respond to the source material.

Examples of possible approaches to Question Three

Using Sources U–Y, to what extent was a treaty in 1840 between Māori and the British Crown inevitable?

Evidence

The question suggests that the factors shaping the relationship between Māori and the Crown would result in some sort of formal agreement. Candidates could argue that:

- there were several key events that made a treaty inevitable: the arrival of Busby, the Declaration of Independence, the arrival and the influence of the missionaries, the establishment of the New Zealand Company, and organised migration
- a treaty was not inevitable, as Britain was reluctant to enter any formal agreement that was not considered to be in its best interests, and this reluctance shaped British policies for a good part of the decade
- events in Britain and in the Bay of Islands resulted in a gradual shift to a recognition of a need to enter into some sort of agreement
- the humanitarian movement helped bring about a treaty, and to what extent
- for some Māori, a treaty was perceived as not being in their best interests
- for some Māori, a more pragmatic approach to a treaty saw a willingness to enter into an agreement with the British Crown.

Candidates might notice that the source material begins and ends with the voices of Māori. A treaty may have been fashioned by the British Crown because of a range of historical factors, but it was Māori who were to make the decision to sign the Treaty. Candidates need to be aware that the textual differences that were to persuade some Māori to sign te Tiriti are not within the scope of this question. What is needed to meet the demands of this question is an informed understanding of the internal and external events and issues that were to bring Māori and the British Crown into a formal relationship in 1840.

Ideas from the sources could include:

Source U1: The Waitangi Tribunal highlights this petition by the northern chiefs to argue that, early in the decade leading up to the signing of the Treaty, there were issues of concern – the possible arrival of the French and the increasing disorder created by ‘thy people’. The candidate could note several ideas inherent in this petition: it was organised by a missionary, William Yate, underlining the possible influence of missionaries in shaping Māori attitudes to the possibility of an agreement with the Crown; there is already a mercantile relationship between Māori and Britain, the European nation regarded in a positive light by Māori is Britain, and protection from the French is sought. A perceptive candidate could note that Māori were ready to deal with these disorderly elements if the Crown was reluctant to intervene – autonomy and sovereignty were theirs.

Source U2: Philippa Mein Smith discusses the arrival of Busby – someone who was to play an important role in creating some of the factors that would necessitate a treaty in 1840. The “*Elizabeth* atrocity” could be noted as being an event that helped to highlight the growing pressure on Britain to take responsibility for its errant citizens.

Source V1: The image of the flag that was chosen to represent this nation’s interests could be used to demonstrate the importance of trade, and the ability of Māori to exploit the resources they controlled. It also is a symbol of the independence that Māori enjoyed.

Source V2: Hazel Petrie puts the selection of the flag into context, emphasising the continuing willingness of Māori to “defend their autonomy”. It also, and perhaps more importantly, describes the emergence of a Declaration of Independence made by northern chiefs. The candidate should be aware of the connection between this declaration and the eventual decision to enter into a formal agreement with Māori.

Source W1: The inclusion of this depiction of the Williams brothers might be questioned by the candidate, as it was painted in the decade after. However, its importance here is to illustrate the influence of the missionaries – an influence that was to increase. The candidate could comment on the role that Henry Williams was to play in the translation of the Treaty into te reo Māori.

Source W2: Claudia Orange wrote an essay for the television series *Frontier of Dreams* and this extract outlines the concerns voiced by humanitarians and missionaries regarding the possible colonisation of this country. The candidate could usefully compare this with Source C and note that Wright’s focus was on the historical forces at play, whereas Orange is focused on the role of the missionary organisations. The candidate could note that an initial reluctance to enter into a formal agreement was to change as pressure grew to find an accommodation that protected the interests of Māori.

Source X1: This poster will be familiar to many candidates: it is an attempt to demonstrate the advantages of emigration from Britain and the benefits of life in a new land.

Source X2: Claudia Orange offers another extract from an essay, and in this brief description of the role of the New Zealand Company, she demonstrates the connection between the actions of the company and its impact on Britain, determining to draw up a treaty between the Crown and Māori.

Sources Y1 and Y2: William Colenso reflects the differing views of Māori regarding the Treaty and its necessity. In **Source Y1**, Tamati Waka Nene sets out some of the steps that have led to this Treaty: the loss of land and mana, the arrival of the sellers of alcohol, the need for a governor as a “friend” to help protect their interests. This is in contrast with Rewa of Ngaitawake in **Source Y2** who, while acknowledging the loss of land, is resolute in his desire to retain sovereignty over “our fathers’ land”. The candidate may note that Rewa had been one of the signatories of the 1831 petition. He had also been a signatory to the Declaration of Independence and had travelled to Australia – hence his reference to Port Jackson.

Cut Scores

Scholarship	Outstanding Scholarship
13 – 18	19 – 24