

Scholarship

2013 Assessment Report

History

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. Their plan demonstrated a clear understanding of the context, the question and a focused, independent argument
- understood the scope of the question and wrote a balanced response
- knew the context of the examination that had been signalled in the Assessment Specifications i.e. 'the importance of historians' different interpretations of historical events' and had a strong understanding of the key ideas relevant to this context
- structured their response effectively and wrote with perception and flair – writing an introduction that was concise and sharply worded and by writing paragraphs that began with topic sentences and were related to the argument put forward in the introduction and writing a convincing conclusion
- presented a clear, accurate and sustained argument, evident in each paragraph and supported by their own accurate, detailed content knowledge and accurate, relevant evidence from some of the sources provided
- responded with a great deal of confidence to the context by bringing in their own detailed content knowledge and historiography and integrating the sources into their argument
- demonstrated their understanding of the historical relationships by using detailed examples from their own content knowledge or from the sources
- argued their case in a sophisticated and coherent way using the sources and their own content knowledge effectively
- critiqued, evaluated historians' interpretations as presented in the sources and from their own knowledge in relation to their argument
- judged the validity, reliability and usefulness of source material in relation to the question and their argument
- gave judgements that were accurate and based on their informed knowledge of the topic.

SCHOLARSHIP

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship but not 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
- demonstrated a clear understanding of the context, the question and a focused, independent argument in the plan
- understood the scope of the question
- knew the context of the examination that had been signalled in the Assessment Specifications i.e. 'the importance of historians' different interpretations of historical events' and had a good understanding of the key ideas relevant to this context
- structured their response effectively and wrote in a convincing manner—including an introduction that was concise and explicit and by writing paragraphs that began with topic sentences and were related to the argument put forward in the introduction and writing a conclusion

- presented a clear, accurate argument, evident in each paragraph and supported by their own accurate, detailed content knowledge and accurate, relevant evidence from some of the sources provided
- responded effectively to the context by bringing in their own detailed content knowledge and historiography and integrating the sources into their argument
- demonstrated their understanding of the historical relationships by using examples from their own content knowledge or from the sources
- argued their case strongly using the sources and their own content knowledge effectively
- critiqued historians' interpretations as presented in the sources and from their own knowledge in relation to their argument
- judged the validity, reliability and usefulness of source material in relation to the question and their argument
- gave judgements that were accurate and based on their informed knowledge of the topic.

OTHER CANDIDATES

Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship typically:

- failed to write a clear introduction that presented their own argument
- had a limited understanding of the difference between the perspectives/viewpoints of contemporaries and historians' interpretations
- covered few of the key ideas relevant to the context
- communicated a simple argument but did not support this with evidence from the sources and their own knowledge
- 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 and the need to comment on the historians and sources provided in relation to their argument
- demonstrated little knowledge of the context beyond a paraphrasing of the sources or made no reference to the sources, seemingly unaware of the need to comment on them
- made sweeping generalisations that showed a lack of understanding and knowledge
- failed to include their own content knowledge
- did not comment on either historical narrative or the usefulness and reliability of the sources in the paper
- failed to look for key details about a source – e.g. Identifying reliability from the title or reference of a source
- were unable to apply basic requirements such as organising the response into paragraphs with topic sentences, using past tense, the need for accurate dates and detail
- seemed to be unprepared to include their own content knowledge in their response
- were restricted by their inability to judge sources and critique historians' narratives in an effective way.

OTHER COMMENTS

Most candidates seemed to be prepared to respond to questions on the context of the importance of historians' different interpretations of historical events'. The Assessment Specifications had clearly signaled this as the context. These candidates were able to explain the key ideas related to the context effectively. It is most important that candidates and teachers refer to the Assessment Specifications at the beginning of the year so that they can fully prepare their students for the Examination

It was clear that when common prepared answers were used candidates often wrote responses that did not address the question or the sources adequately.

Note that:

- candidates are required to recognise the author of a source and not the author of the book the source was cited from.
- candidates should not write out the citation
- candidates need to look at the date of a source as this is important in questioning the reliability of a source
- candidates need to know, understand and be able to critically evaluate (beyond generic comments) key historians for a topic – when they wrote; why they hold particular views; how they have been or may be revised by other historians
- some candidates need to consider the appropriateness of the topics they are using at this level in terms of breadth and depth of historiography such as My Lai massacre; validity of topics as History, such as sexual relations, the miniskirt, US war on drugs, Pocahontas; use of English literature examples especially Shakespeare such as Gertrude from Macbeth instead of historical examples.