

Assessment Schedule – 2025

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 from sources 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 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 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

To what extent do the historical narratives in Sources A–H enable historians to understand the importance of individuals in shaping historical events?

Evidence

The candidate could respond to the question in several different ways / use a range of indicators when assessing an individual's historical importance, such as:

- duration of their influence on political, economic, or social structures
- the scale of impact on populations or policies
- the degree of societal change initiated or catalysed by their actions
- their role in shaping dominant historical narratives
- how their actions reflect or are shaped by wider forces (a dialectical approach).

The candidate may challenge Carlyle's "Great Man" theory, exploring the tension between individual decision-making and structural determinants, and consider how historians' own biases or ideological positions influence their interpretations.

Below is how each source offers valuable insights and how candidates might use them to develop an argument about individual versus structural influence in history.

There is a wealth of source material that focuses on the role of individuals in shaping historical events and the various historical narratives that argue for their relevance. The candidate should be able to bring to their argument both a knowledge and understanding of individuals *not* included in the source material and how they shaped historical events, such as:

- Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev, the Russian Revolutions, and the Cold War
- Churchill and World War II
- Kennedy, LBJ, Nixon, and the Vietnam War
- Catherine the Great and the expansion of the Russian Empire
- Golda Meir and Israeli leadership during the Yom Kippur War
- Nelson Mandela and the end of apartheid
- Malcolm X as a radical counterpoint to Martin Luther King Jr in the Civil Rights Movement
- Gandhi and anti-colonial resistance in India
- Julius Vogel and colonial consolidation in New Zealand.

The candidate could use the absence of historians who have a Marxist view (e.g. Hobsbawm), feminist view (e.g. Joan Scott), or a non-Western view (beyond a *te ao Māori* approach) to question the validity of the source material, arguing that to enable an understanding of the importance of individuals in shaping historical events, a wider and more varied range of source material is needed.

The provided sources offer different perspectives on the role of individuals in shaping historical events, allowing historians to assess the extent of individual agency in history. While some sources emphasise the influence of individuals, others argue for a broader structural approach, demonstrating the complexities of historical interpretation / narratives.

Ideas from the sources could include:

Source A1: Margaret MacMillan argues Carlyle's approach was more nuanced than often assumed – he saw history as a tapestry of individual lives embedded in societal contexts. This may enable the candidate to frame individuals not in isolation, but as products and agents of their time. It supports a qualified use of individual biography in historical explanation, especially when combined with analysis of social conditions.

Source A2: Margaret MacMillan argues Churchill's personal decisions had significant consequences; MacMillan uses counterfactual reasoning to show how history could have been altered by his absence. It supports arguments for individual agency, particularly in times of crisis, while still acknowledging structural constraints. It allows candidates to explore contingency and the exceptional influence of key figures under specific conditions.

Source B1:	Richard J. Evans sets out Edward Hallett Carr's argument that history is inseparable from context and from the historian's own position. The past must be interpreted within its social and political environment. This may encourage the candidate to consider structural forces as central, and to question the reliability of any account that centres individuals, without considering the wider context. It also raises the issue of the subjectivity of historical interpretation.
Source B2:	Edward Hallett Carr (on the role of historians and interpretation) argues that historians' perspectives and societal contexts shape how historical figures are remembered or emphasised. The candidate may use this to critique the idea of objective accounts of "great individuals", showing how historical narratives often reflect present-day values and ideological concerns.
Source C:	Barbara Tuchman argues that events are real and verifiable – facts matter. She stresses the importance of events themselves, and not just their interpretation. This supports the candidate who may want to argue that individuals really did shape events, and that history is not only a matter of interpretation. It reasserts the reality of agency but does not dismiss context entirely.
Source D1:	Seán Lang argues that while broader forces matter, individual decisions – especially in moments of crisis – still have historical weight. Lang encourages a balanced view: the candidate may argue that individuals matter most when they have access to power or make decisions under pressure. He also warns against simplistic heroism or villainy.
Source D2:	Lucasta Miller argues that the 'Great Man' theory is limited – by excluding women and ordinary people, it distorts history. Most historians find a middle ground. This offers a feminist and philosophical critique of individualism in history. It invites a candidate to consider whose agency is recognised and to critique the elitism inherent in traditional narratives.
Source E:	Sheila Fitzpatrick argues that even under authoritarian regimes, leadership was often collective in nature. Personal dictatorship co-existed with group decision-making. This undermines simplistic portrayals of individuals like Stalin or Khrushchev as sole agents of change. It allows candidates to argue that individual power is often institutional, collaborative, or constrained – especially in political systems like the USSR.
Source F1:	Howard Zinn (on collective agency) argues that power lies in the movement, not the individual. Change occurs when large groups – like soldiers, pilots, or workers – refuse to comply or act together. This allows the candidate to consider that individuals matter as part of wider collective dynamics. This is useful when critiquing the 'Great Man' theory or evaluating large-scale resistance.
Source F2:	Howard Zinn (on how heroism is constructed) argues that the focus on individual "heroes" is an ideological choice. Celebrated figures (e.g. Columbus) can distract from broader systems of oppression or violence. This may encourage the candidate to critically assess which individuals are remembered and why. NB: This is especially valuable for Question Three also when analysing colonial leaders like Grey, or military figures like Colonel Nixon. Zinn's work helps interrogate the politics of commemoration and historical selection.
Source G:	Judith Binney and Gillian Chaplin argue that colonial history often omits or marginalises Māori individuals, especially women, or those without military or elite status. This source supports candidates in critiquing dominant narratives by asking: whose individual agency gets recorded? This is powerful for evaluating representation and erasure, especially in 1852–1873 narratives. It invites a decolonising approach to how historical "importance" is framed.

Source H: Melinda Webber and Te Kapua O'Connor assert that Māori leadership is relational and collaborative – captured in the metaphor of “weaving the collective” – decision-making was often shared and fluid. This is useful for analysing non-Western models of individual impact, particularly in Māori contexts. This may encourage the candidate to explore how Māori individuals (male and female) exercised leadership in non-hierarchical or interconnected ways, especially during land struggles or negotiation periods between 1852 and 1873.

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. • Uses a range of carefully selected sources to support the argument. • 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. • Uses a range of carefully selected sources to support the argument. • 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. • Uses a range of sources to support the argument.	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 I–S enable historians to assess whether Margaret Thatcher was the key force in shaping events during her time as British Prime Minister, rather than broader historical factors?

Evidence

The effects of Thatcher's role in shaping events during her time as prime minister are complex. The candidate should demonstrate an ability to qualify her impact across cultural, political, social, and short- and long-term dimensions. High-level responses will not only describe what Thatcher did but also critically explore the extent to which she shaped events as an individual, versus being shaped by broader structural forces (e.g. the Cold War politics, economic conditions, ideological trends).

The candidate could respond to these “complexities” in several different ways, such as:

- exploring the differing causes and effects of Thatcher's leadership decisions, particularly in relation to the Falklands War
- considering the continuing impact of her policies and rhetoric on British identity, politics, and society
- analysing the range of historical relationships involved – between Thatcher and other individuals, institutions, or states (e.g. Reagan, the military, public opinion)
- discussing the differing perspectives on Thatcher's legacy (e.g. media portrayal, public sentiment)
- evaluating whether Thatcher's leadership reflected existing patterns / traditions in British governance, or whether she fundamentally reshaped them.

Ideas from the sources could include:

Source I: The biography provides introductory material and offers an overview of Thatcher's rise as the dominant force in the Conservative Party in the context of gender politics at the time, her leadership style, key decisions, and relationships (e.g. with Reagan), alongside the economic and social challenges of the era. The candidate may consider the historical relationship of change and continuity when discussing her role in politics as a female Member of Parliament, eventual party leader, and prime minister. This source also illustrates the relationship of cause and effect between Thatcher's leadership style and the shifting expectations of female political leadership in Britain. The source could enable the candidate to examine how her personal ambition, leadership, and policy choices contributed to political change in the late 1970s and early 1980s. The source also invites analysis of how much her actions were shaped by broader structural conditions, such as the economic crisis and public dissatisfaction with previous governments.

Source J: Dominic Sandbrook provides important introductory material on Thatcher. He examines the origins and interpretations of “Thatcherism”, a term that was coined by critics to describe Thatcher's perceived right-wing fanaticism. The source explores the origins and contested interpretations of “Thatcherism”, highlighting it as both a personal political project and a response to wider ideological shifts. It situates Thatcher within broader movements, such as neoliberalism and the global New Right. The candidate may use this to evaluate whether Thatcher's importance is as a political figure who shaped historical events in Britain, or whether she was more a figure shaped by her time. The source may encourage discussion on how “Thatcherism” (general) was framed in opposition to other ideologies and help the candidate to assess the extent of her personal influence (specific) on the political environment. The candidate could draw on differing interpretations of the term which identify Thatcherism as populist authoritarianism, or the use of the term ‘saviour’ to describe Thatcher's role in Britain. The development of the term itself speaks to the historical significance of her time as prime minister.

Source K:	In this speech, Thatcher frames socialism as a threat to Britain's strength and positions her leadership as essential for national revival. It reveals her ideological convictions and how she constructed a narrative of crisis. The source provides evidence for debating whether she shaped events or responded to them, especially in the context of Cold War anxieties and Britain's economic decline. The candidate could use this source to explore the historical relationship of change and continuity. In her speech, Thatcher is juxtaposing Britain's historical greatness with the contemporary challenges it is facing. Thatcher believes that Britain can continue to influence world affairs but only through stronger military policies and the repudiation of socialism. Her portrayal of socialism as an existential threat reflects broader patterns and trends in Cold War rhetoric. The candidate could note her rhetorical strategies and how she used ideology to justify policy. She argues that the British 'way of life' is under threat and that to prevent the decline of the nation and reassert Britain's influence on the world stage, the Conservative Party must be returned to power. Thatcher draws on nostalgia for Britain's past to influence the present.
Source L:	Margaret MacMillan asserts that the Falklands War saved Thatcher from plummeting approval ratings and led to her re-election. MacMillan emphasises the role of chance and personal resolve in Thatcher's success during the Falklands War, showing how her individual choices (such as ignoring advice / overruling advisers and that she took gambles that another prime minister may not have) shaped key political outcomes. The candidate could discuss how British success in the Falklands War provided the opportunity for Thatcher to draw on the nostalgia of Britain's past as a great imperial power and allowed for comparisons between Thatcher and the 'beloved' wartime prime minister Winston Churchill. The candidate could use this source to evaluate the extent to which Thatcher's personal leadership, not just structures like the Cold War or Britain's economic situation, played a pivotal role in political events, especially in redefining her popularity and authority.
Source M:	Afua Hirsch and Peter Frankopan's podcast is valuable for exploring how the past influences the present – the importance of past ideas and concepts of Britain and Thatcher's greatness influencing present decisions. The source discusses how the Falklands War was a 'gift' to Thatcher, as it provided the opportunity for her to embody the 'Iron Lady' moniker that had been ascribed to her by her supporters, while also drawing parallel between the Falklands and Britain's role in World War II. The candidate may argue that Thatcher consciously shaped her leadership in the mould of Churchill, using the Falklands War to construct a narrative of moral clarity, national unity, and revived imperial pride. The candidate may consider how personal ambition and media-savvy leadership can shape public memory and historical interpretation, particularly through comparisons to wartime Britain.
Source N:	The photograph presents Thatcher as a victorious and heroic leader, reinforcing a narrative of personal triumph and national pride after the Falklands War. The candidate could argue that Thatcher is explicitly positioning herself as a wartime prime minister, associating herself visually with the victories achieved by the Parachute Regiment. The visual composition, her central placement, the troops surrounding her, her wave and smile suggest admiration and portray her almost like a celebrity or wartime icon. The candidate could use this source to argue how Thatcher's image was carefully constructed and how she became a symbol of British resolve and renewal. It supports arguments about her personal influence in shaping public memory of the war and the role of individuals in shaping political narratives.
Source O:	Nicholas Garland's cartoon of Thatcher 'clearing the decks' portrays Thatcher as a decisive and commanding leader, brushing aside international diplomacy in favour of military action during the Falklands War, highlighting her combative style and disdain for compromise. The candidate could use this to show how Thatcher was seen by supporters and / or critics as a dominant individual who shaped foreign policy through unilateral action, reinforcing arguments about her strong individual impact on the course of events.

Source P:	This speech is a powerful example of how Thatcher actively constructed a narrative of national revival and personal leadership, using the Falklands War to frame herself as the inheritor of Churchillian resolve and British imperial legacy. The candidate could use this to argue for the centrality of Thatcher as an individual shaping historical events, particularly in how she used rhetorical leadership and military success to define Britain's political identity in the 1980s.
Source Q:	Anne Perkins' obituary in <i>The Guardian</i> offers a broad and reflective summary of Thatcher's long-term personal and political impact, portraying her as both a transformative individual and a product of wider structural shifts. The source enables the candidate to show the effects of "Thatcherism" and her continuing significance in shaping British politics (still relevant today). It considers the impact of the Thatcher years and argues that her government changed the course of British politics to such an extent that successive governments have been unable or unwilling to reverse many of her policies. The candidate could use this source to support an argument that while structural forces shaped Thatcher's context, it was her leadership that legitimised, accelerated, and embedded significant ideological and policy changes.
Source R:	The photograph captures long-term public responses, particularly from left-wing critics who viewed Thatcher as a destructive force, and reflects how deeply divisive her legacy remained decades later. The candidate could use this to show how Thatcher's personal impact was perceived as significant and enduring, suggesting she was seen by many as <i>the</i> key figure responsible for causing social and economic upheaval, even if those effects were tied to wider policies and ideologies.
Source S:	Ken Pyne's cartoon highlights the dominating effect of Thatcher's personality and policies in the political and cultural landscape of the 1980s, reinforcing the view of her as a towering individual figure in British history. The candidate could use this to argue that Thatcher's personal role was so influential, it defined an entire era, supporting interpretations that emphasised the individual over structural forces.

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 T–Z, to what extent did the governors of Aotearoa New Zealand shape historical events and their consequences in the years 1852 to 1873?

Evidence

The candidate could approach the question by evaluating the role of colonial governors, particularly George Grey and Thomas Robert Gore Brown, within a period marked by expanding settler colonisation, as well as Māori efforts to protect mana and forge new forms of political participation.

This was a pivotal era. On the one hand, settler governments consolidated control over land, law, and resources, facilitated by the 1852 Constitution and the policies aimed at expanding British settlement. On the other, Māori communities responded with a mix of resistance and adaptation, developing movements like the Kīngitanga and prophetic religions, and attempting to engage with or reshape colonial institutions.

There is no single individual who can be said to have shaped all major events in this era. However, certain individuals, Māori and Pākehā, did play significant roles in shaping key events. Colonial governors were central to many decisions around diplomacy, land alienation, war, and legislation that led to consolidation of colonisation. However, their influence was never absolute. The candidate should be aware that the actions of governors like Grey and Gore Browne were shaped by broader structural forces: settler land hunger, imperial ideology, Crown policy, economic imperatives, and legal frameworks, such as the Native Lands Acts and the New Zealand Settlements Act.

Importantly, candidates should not overlook Māori agency. A sophisticated response will consider how Māori leadership was grounded in whakapapa, mana, and collective hapū and iwi-based strategies. Rangatira, male and female, exercised political authority not as isolated “great figures”, but as representatives of broader communal will. These collective strategies often responded to, contested, or bypassed colonial governance, suggesting that governors’ actions were just one part of a more complex political landscape.

While the question foregrounds individual agency, and the sources often focus on Grey and Gore Browne, the candidate could also consider:

- the ways governors actively shaped events through war, diplomacy, and legislative support
- the limits of their authority in the face of Māori resistance and settler political pressure
- the actions of other influential individuals (e.g. Donald McLean, Julius Vogel, Te Ua Haumēne, Robert Wynard, George Bowen, Wiremu Tamihana, Rewi Maniapoto, Te Paea), whose roles were equally pivotal in driving historical change.

A superficial response may describe governors’ actions without analysing their impact or context. A stronger argument will evaluate the interplay between governor agency and structural forces like colonisation, economic transformation, and Māori resistance. The candidate should engage critically with the sources – identifying purpose, bias, limitations, and omissions, and consider whether governors were architects of change or actors constrained by the momentum of settler colonialism.

Ideas from the sources could include:

Source T:	Lachy Paterson highlights the complex and contested nature of authority during this period, showing that while governors such as Grey exercised considerable influence, especially through personal diplomacy, their power was often limited in regions where Māori continued to retain tino rangatiratanga. Here, Grey is portrayed as particularly adept at courting Māori leaders to extend Crown control, but the source also suggests that such influence depended heavily on Māori willingness to engage. The candidate could argue that while Grey helped shape Māori-Crown relations in the early years, his approach was ultimately constrained by enduring Māori autonomy, especially in areas outside Pākehā-dominated areas. This allows discussion of the limits of the governor’s power to shape events in this period, and how Māori leaders not only responded to, but also actively shaped colonial policy and its implementation. The candidate could contrast Grey’s earlier success with his later failure to manage Māori leadership in the Waikato, highlighting how individual influence was shaped by changing political contexts.
------------------	--

Source U:	Mark Derby illustrates how the promises of inclusion through the 1852 Constitution Act were undercut by structural exclusions that governors such as Grey and Gore Browne helped shape or failed to challenge. While Section 71 theoretically allowed for Māori self-government, its non-implementation reveals how governors sidelined meaningful Māori participation. The candidate could argue that this failure contributed to Māori disillusionment with colonial institutions and prompted leaders such as Wiremu Tamihana to create alternative political systems, most notably the Kīngitanga. The source supports an argument that governors shaped historical events not only by what they did, but also by what they failed to do, creating the conditions for significant Māori-led initiatives that redefined political authority in the colony.
Sources V1, V2, and V3:	These sources highlight significant events that relate to land: iwi holding onto land as a means of controlling Pākehā settlement (pūpuri whenua), Māori land alienation, and government policy in encouraging immigration through the promise of land.
Source V1:	Ranginui Walker reveals that Māori resistance to land sales and colonisation was both a collective and strategic response to settler expansion, one initially aimed at working with the colonial system. Tamihana's attempt to engage Governor Gore Browne in creating a 'Council of Chiefs' as a Māori policy-making body, as allowed under Section 71 of the Constitution (see Source U), shows that Māori leaders had a willingness to work with governors and within the new colonial state structures. However, Gore Browne's refusal to meet Tamihana (possibly compounded by the role of government officials, including Native Secretary Donald McLean in preventing Tamihana from gaining an audience with the governor), led directly to the abandonment of that strategy and the eventual foundation of the Kīngitanga. The candidate could argue that this shift illustrates that while governors had the potential to shape events through recognition and cooperation, their inaction or disregard for important rangatira also significantly shaped events by closing off peaceful avenues. The rise of the Kīngitanga can be seen as a direct response to the governor's failure to accommodate Māori sovereignty within the colonial framework, highlighting both the limits and unintended consequence of the governor's actions.
Source V2:	This advertisement demonstrates how immigration policy, often supported or enabled by colonial governors, was a critical factor in the rapid alienation of Māori land. The Auckland Province's land grants to attract settlers from 1858 onwards reflected a broader strategy of settler expansion that directly contributed to Māori alarm and resistance. Although this was a provincial initiative, the governor's role in enabling immigration through broader legislative and political support cannot be ignored. It is relevant that the governor at the time, Robert Wynyard, held dual military and political roles and had close ties to Auckland's settler elite. The candidate could argue that governors helped shape this period not only through direct actions, but also by endorsing, or failing to challenge, policies that reinforced the settler-driven push for land, further marginalising Māori authority. The scale of land alienation incentivised by these schemes helped trigger responses, such as pūpuri whenua, and the emergence of Kīngitanga. This source invites discussion about whether governors were key agents of colonial policy or facilitators of deeper structural forces already driving colonisation.

Source V3:	These graphs reflect the systemic transformation of New Zealand through colonisation, particularly through land loss, surveying, and the imposition of new economic systems. It offers a macro-level perspective on the scale and pace of Māori land alienation between 1840 and 1920, with the most intense periods of loss aligning with governor-led initiatives to consolidate Crown authority and facilitate settler expansion. The candidate could also observe the sharp decline in the Māori population before 1874 and consider to what extent this was linked to immigration pressures and demographic displacement. Julius Vogel's immigration scheme, launched in 1870, accelerated this trend, although he was not a governor. While broader colonial structures clearly shaped this transformation, individual governors such as Grey and Gore Browne played instrumental roles in implementing policies through war, land confiscation, and infrastructure projects that hastened Māori marginalisation. However, the overwhelming scale and continuity of land loss shown in this source also raises important questions about the limits of the governor's power within an increasingly self-propelling settler-colonial system. This source invites the candidate to debate the extent to which governors acted as architects of change or as agents operating within a powerful and expanding colonial machinery.
Sources W1, W2, and W3:	These sources capture how war became a central mechanism of colonisation and how individuals, such as the governor and rangatira, shaped or contested that process. These sources also focus on the active and passive roles of the governors.
Source W1:	Michael Belgrave provides a clear example of Governor Gore Browne directly shaping historical events through his decision to enforce the disputed Waitara land sale, an act that helped spark the First Taranaki War. Gore Browne's decision, made in the name of defending the Queen's sovereignty, demonstrates the significant authority governors held over military and political developments. The Kohimarama Conference of 1860, convened by Gore Browne and Donald McLean, further illustrates his attempt to influence Māori opinion and fracture opposition by selectively engaging kūpapa rangatira / loyalist chiefs. However, the limited turnout and rangatira reluctance to condemn Wiremu Kīngi show the limits of the governor's authority and the enduring mana of individual rangatira. This source could enable the candidate to argue that while Gore Browne actively shaped events, his influence was contested, and Māori agency remained a powerful counterforce to governor control.
Source W2:	The RNZ source explores Governor George Grey's return to New Zealand in 1861 and his evolving role in escalating tensions with the Kīngitanga. While Grey had earlier built respectful relationships with Māori leaders like Pōtatau Te Wherowhero, by the 1860s he had become increasingly autocratic and unwilling to compromise with Māori or Pākehā political leaders. The source shows that Grey actively chose confrontation over conciliation, signalling as early as 1861 his intention to take the Waikato. His refusal to reassure Kīngitanga leaders and his centralised approach to power were key in pushing the colony towards war. The candidate could argue that Grey was a pivotal figure who deliberately shaped major historical events, such as the Waikato War, through personal decisions and political strategy – even if those choices often clashed with other colonial authorities and intensified resistance. This supports a view that some governors exercised considerable personal influence, though not always with successful or stabilising outcomes.

Source W3: Lachy Paterson and Angela Wanhalla argue that while Governor Grey played a central role in escalating tensions leading up to the Waikato War in 1863, Māori leaders (particularly Te Paea / Princess Sophie), significantly shaped the course of events by actively opposing premature armed conflict. Te Paea led a diplomatic delegation to Auckland to engage directly with Governor Grey, demonstrating Māori willingness to pursue peaceful negotiation before the outbreak of war. More critically, when factions within the Kīngitanga led by Rewi Maniapoto considered launching a raid, Te Paea publicly denounced the proposed violence in a powerful speech, reflecting her authority and influence in shaping Kīngitanga strategy. Ultimately, her moderate stance prevailed, and it was the British Army and not the Kīngitanga, that initiated hostilities. The candidate could argue that although Governor Grey made key decisions that contributed to the outbreak of war, Māori leaders like Te Paea also decisively influenced the timing and nature of these events. Furthermore, the source challenges interpretations that overstate the governor's agency by showing that Māori political leadership (especially by women), could constrain, delay, or redirect conflict, thereby shaping historical outcomes, both alongside and in opposition to the governor's agenda.

Source X: Barbara Brookes highlights both the direct and structural roles of the colonial government, supported by governors, in reshaping New Zealand through war and law. While it acknowledges widespread conflict across the North Island, and resistance through religious-political movements such as Pai Mārire and Ringatū – it also points to key governor-supported policies – particularly the Native Land Acts of 1862 and 1865, and the New Zealand Settlements Act of 1863. These Acts were passed during periods of strong governor influence and laid the groundwork for mass land alienation by undermining collective Māori ownership. Governors did not act alone, but they were instrumental in implementing and endorsing these systems. This source may allow the candidate to assess the governors' role as key enablers of dispossession, showing that their power was most significant when aligned with settler interests and legal structures, but not always sufficient to suppress Māori resistance or halt alternative visions of sovereignty.

Source Y1:	The photograph reveals the power of material symbols like flags to shape both Pākehā and Māori narratives of Ngā Pakanga o Aotearoa (the New Zealand Wars). Flags served as important tools during the conflict for both sides, representing loyalty, resistance, and political alignment. This flag symbolises how the colonial government, supported by settler society, sought to publicly reward and reinforce Māori loyalty during the wars. Although it was organised and gifted by Anne Logan, the wife of a senior military officer, it can also be seen as part of a broader colonial strategy aligned with the governor's efforts to foster inter-hapū or iwi division, and to secure kūpapa or Crown-aligned Māori support. This source illustrates that colonial leadership (including the governors), shaped historical events not only through military action, but also through symbolic gestures that cultivated allegiance and legitimised Crown authority. However, it also highlights that Māori involvement in conflicts like Moutoa was driven by iwi-specific political decisions and intra-Māori dynamics – not merely imposed by colonial influence. The candidate could use this source to examine how governors' policies exploited or reinforced such divisions but should also weigh this against the independent political strategies of Māori leaders and the symbolic actions of settlers who worked to bolster Crown legitimacy.
Source Y2:	The cartoon highlights tensions between the governor and other colonial figures, such as missionaries, during the New Zealand Wars. The cartoon and accompanying text illustrate how some missionaries, including Octavius Hadfield and Bishop Selwyn, publicly opposed Governor Gore Browne's actions, especially his use of military force in Taranaki. Their criticism of settler greed and government aggression shows that the governor's decisions were controversial and contested even within settler society. This source helps the candidate assess the extent to which governors such as Gore Browne shaped events through military and political choices, and how their authority was challenged by influential figures who sought to protect Māori interests. It also raises questions about the limits of the governor's power and the role of moral opposition in shaping public discourse and policy.
Source Z:	The letter illustrates Māori resistance to both the colonial government and the Church, directly blaming Governor Grey for acts of violence at places like Rangiriri and Rangiaowhia. It reveals that Māori leaders held the governor personally accountable for the brutality of the wars, linking him to systemic injustices and acts of colonial aggression. The words of the Ōpōtiki rangatira demonstrate that Grey's decisions not only influenced military outcomes but also provoked deep Māori resentment and resistance. The candidate could assess the extent to which Governor Grey's wartime leadership catalysed further conflict and intensified Māori opposition. At the same time, the source highlights how Māori leaders asserted moral authority to challenge the legitimacy of settler colonialism. It reflects broader Māori disillusionment with both the Crown and the Church – and reveals how leaders actively shaped resistance through political and ethical protest – not merely as reactionary figures, but as initiators of collective action. This source may allow the candidate to explore both the central role of the governor in escalating tensions and the powerful agency of Māori individuals who used language and leadership to unite communities in opposition. It challenges the idea that Māori resistance was purely a response to colonial violence, instead showing how it was also shaped by principled protest and strategic leadership.

Note: The context for this question is signalled to the candidate at the start of the academic year and so there is an expectation that there will be a familiarity with some of the ideas in these sources. The candidate will note that the source material dealing with Question Three is brief and that the material is not comprehensive in covering all the governors of the period, or all the significant events during this period. This is because there is an expectation that this element of the question will be familiar to many candidates following three years of senior-level History, in which the relevant areas covered in the 1852 to 1873 period have been studied.

Cut Scores

Scholarship	Outstanding Scholarship
13–18	19–24