

Scholarship

2009 Assessment Report

History

COMMENTARY

The 2009 Scholarship History paper was completed very well by those who attained Outstanding Scholarship and Scholarship. Most candidates showed awareness of the requirements of each of the six skills required for Scholarship History, particularly how to present an argument, how to critique historical narratives and how to judge historical sources, as shown in the Scholarship Criteria on the Scholarship Resources page of the NZQA website.

Top candidates presented their own independent argument about the extent to which Charles/the Kingitanga was a catalyst in their introduction and body of their response, wrote in a formal manner, and unpacked the source citation in order to critique the sources accurately. They showed understanding of the need to look at the date of a source as it is important in questioning the reliability of a source, and they were able to distinguish between the author of a source and the author of the book the source was cited from in the source citation.

Some candidates demonstrated a lack of understanding of how to critically evaluate the narrative of key historians. They demonstrated a lack of knowledge of who the important historians were, when they wrote, why they hold particular views, how they have been or may be revised by other historians.

SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- planned their response using the planning pages provided, to outline the main idea for each paragraph, the sources they would use in that paragraph and the historical narrative that was appropriate
- in their plan demonstrated a clear understanding of the critical underpinnings of the question and a focused, independent argument
- understood the scope of the question, and demonstrated a perceptive understanding of content that covered the entire historical period in question
- wrote an introduction that covered the breadth of the question yet was concise and contained a very clear, focused, independent argument
- structured their response effectively, writing paragraphs that began with topic sentences and were related to the argument put forward in the introduction
- communicated a clear, accurate and sustained argument that was evident in each paragraph, and was supported by their own accurate, detailed content knowledge along with accurate, relevant evidence from some of the sources provided
- integrated the sources with perception and insight with their own content knowledge and key historians argument
- critically evaluated historians' interpretations as presented in the sources or from their own knowledge
- wrote fluently, clearly, and succinctly, and argued a case convincingly.

SCHOLARSHIP

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship but not Scholarship with Outstanding Performance commonly:

- planned their response using the planning pages to outline the main idea for each paragraph, the sources they would use in that paragraph and the historical narrative that was appropriate

- in their plan demonstrated a clear understanding of the question and a focused, independent argument
- understood the scope of the question and were able to show knowledge over the entire historical period in question
- wrote an introduction that covered the breadth of the question yet was concise and contained a very clear argument
- structured their response effectively writing paragraphs that began with topic sentences and were related to the argument put forward in the introduction
- consistently communicated a clear, accurate and sustained argument that was evident in each paragraph and was supported by their own accurate, detailed content knowledge and accurate, relevant evidence from some of the sources provided
- integrated the sources well with their own content knowledge and argument
- demonstrated their knowledge of the key historians and arguments by integrating into their argument accurate and relevant historians' interpretations that were not provided in the sources
- critiqued, and evaluated historians' interpretations as presented in the sources or from their own knowledge
- judged the validity, reliability and usefulness of source material in relation to the question and their argument, with judgements that were accurate, were based on their informed knowledge of the topic, that demonstrated an understanding of the issue based on their content knowledge, and demonstrated an understanding of the critical underpinnings of the process of historical research and study

OTHER CANDIDATES

Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship or Scholarship with Outstanding Performance commonly:

- failed to write a clear introduction that presented their own argument
- outlined the various arguments in the introduction rather than presenting their own argument in the introduction
- used the key idea as their introduction without any attempt to write it into their own words or apply it to an argument
- presented the key idea as their introduction or failed to present their argument in the introduction
- wrote a narrative or descriptive response based on the source material with little or no awareness of the need to present an argument in relation to the question asked or of the need to comment on the historians and sources provided in relation to their argument
- demonstrated little knowledge beyond a paraphrasing of the sources or made no reference to the sources, seemingly unaware of the need to comment on them
- made little or no attempt to evaluate the historical narratives relevant to the question, or showed no recognition of the historians mentioned
- made little or no attempt to judge the validity and usefulness of the sources in relation to their argument
- had no sense of the chronology of the topic and no knowledge of central concepts such as personal monarchy, favourites, divine right, nominal versus substantive sovereignty, nationalism
- lacked fundamental knowledge of central content such as:

- the significance of the terms of the Treaty, which tribes did not sign the Treaty, land loss from 1840 onwards, competing assertions of sovereignty prior to the formation of the Kingitanga, the formation of the Kingitanga, the key information on each of the Wars
- the nature of personal monarchy, the nature of the archaic state, divine right and the hierarchical nature of society, how parliament divided in 1641, some MPs supporting a King who was prepared to wage war against parliament; the difference between favourites and ministers; the roles of the Short and Long Parliaments between 1640 – 1642, how Charles dealt with his parliaments 1625 – 1629, the difference between economic trends and the financial management of the monarchs up to 1640.