



NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

Scholarship, 2005

History **93403**

National Statistics

Assessment Report

History, Scholarship, 2005 93403

National Statistics

No. Scholarship Results	Results			
	Outstanding Scholarship		Scholarship	
	No. Awards	% of L3 Cohort	No. Awards	% of L3 Cohort
158	20	0.4%	138	2.8%

Commentary

Scholarship candidates are required to display an integration of the six skills in one piece of work rather than compartmentalise them into separate answers.

The ability to synthesise ideas, show understanding of historical relationships and contextual issues, make judgements about evidence and / or research, evaluate historical narrative and present a critical argument must be evident in candidates' answers.

The best candidates demonstrated flair, literacy, use of evidence and, in particular, ability to critically evaluate the views of historians and the evidence available to them.

The best-performing candidates most commonly demonstrated the following skills and / or knowledge:

- Sophistication – writing fluently in a complex and insightful way
- integration of ideas from the sources and from their own knowledge into their argument in a perceptive way
- critical evaluation throughout their articles of historians' views, with informed judgements about the nature of historical evidence and research.

Some candidates demonstrated the following skills and / or knowledge:

- ability to effectively communicate an argument that covered the whole historical period and was supported by evidence derived from both the source material and the candidate's own knowledge. Very few candidates failed to bring in their own knowledge, which was a vast improvement on 2004
- use of a clear argument in their introduction, sustaining it usually through to a tight, sophisticated conclusion
- ability to engage with the views of historians/contemporaries and critically evaluate their views and perspectives, rather than simply 'name drop'
- ability to make informed judgements about the nature of historical evidence. These usually involved the appropriate and valid use of terms such as "limitation", "reliability", "validity", "usefulness", "bias", "propaganda", "selection", "appropriate" and "representativeness".

Other candidates commonly lacked the following skills and / or knowledge:

- ability to construct an argument. Too often they simply repeated a historical narrative instead of presenting a relevant argument. Their work sometimes contained factual errors and was poorly written with syntax errors and poor paragraphing
- awareness of historiographical debate and/or ability to engage with historians' views. Often they lacked any reference to the limitations of the sources and evidence provided, or disregarded the sources altogether
- ability to take other than a source by source approach, forcing low level, awkward evaluative comments out of the sources. In every case, this was to the detriment of their argument and led to them scoring low marks for synthesis. Candidates should present a historical argument first and foremost, and use the evidence in the sources to support this – not the other way around.