

2015 NZ Scholarship Assessment Report

History

Part B: Report on performance standard

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance	<p>Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 to the question they selected rather than a learned response to the context of 'significance/relevance/importance' that was outlined in the Assessment Specifications communicated a very strong understanding of the context of the examination i.e. 'significance/relevance/importance of history' through their explanation of the key ideas relevant to this context argued a case in a sophisticated and coherent way presented a clear, accurate and sustained argument, evident in each paragraph synthesised the sources and their own detailed content knowledge in a balanced and effective manner wrote with perception and flair structured their response effectively demonstrated their understanding of the historical relationships by using detailed examples from their own content knowledge or from the sources evaluated historians' narratives in the sources within the paper and historians from their own knowledge judged the validity, reliability and usefulness of source material in relation to the question and their argument. These judgements were accurate and based on their informed knowledge of the topic.
Scholarship	<p>Candidates who were awarded Scholarship commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 they selected and wrote a clear response to the question and not a learned response to the context of 'significance/relevance/importance' that was outlined in the Assessment Specifications communicated a strong understanding of the context of the examination i.e. 'significance/relevance/importance of history' through their explanation of the key ideas relevant to this context made direct reference to the key words/phrases in the question wrote clearly including an introduction to their argument, substantiated argument and a conclusion argued their case strongly throughout their article argument was supported by accurate, detailed content knowledge and accurate, relevant evidence from some of the sources provided, demonstrating strong understanding of the topic(s) they had studied and an ability to unpack the sources provided effectively balanced their use of own content knowledge and sources structured their argument logically i.e. chronologically or thematically critiqued historians' interpretations as presented in the sources and from their own knowledge in relation to their argument. Demonstrated a strong understanding of the historical arguments related to the topic(s) they had studied judged the validity, reliability and usefulness of source material in relation to the question and their argument. These judgements were accurate and based on their

	informed knowledge of the topic.
Other candidates	<p>Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • failed to write a clear introduction that presented their own argument • addressed the context signalled in the Assessment Specifications and not the Question they selected in order to develop their argument • 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 to include knowledge from their own study • communicated a simple argument but did not support this with evidence from the sources and/or their own knowledge • did not balance their own content knowledge with content and ideas from the sources • used quotes and theories that they appeared to have rote learnt and therefore had insufficient understanding of in order to integrate with the sources in the paper and/or their argument. They tended not to integrate content knowledge from topic(s) they had actually studied and had a good understanding of • poor choice of topics that could be effectively applied to the context of ‘the significance/relevance/importance of history’ e.g. one battle or event that did not show the significance/relevance/importance of history and sociological/current issues such as AIDs • showed less ability to read sources and summarise key ideas accurately • fewer skills in unpacking sources especially basic analysis such as source details and use these in their discussion/argument • showed little understanding of the nature of history, the role of an historian as opposed to a journalist or a novelist • inability to explain and develop the key ideas related to the context • did not have a good understanding of the key historical arguments related to their topic of understanding and were unable to apply the historical arguments to their individual response to their argument • did not refer to the contemporaries or historians in the paper or bring in any from their own knowledge • did not comment on the usefulness and reliability of sources in the paper • did not utilise the titles and references of the sources in the Resource Booklet to inform the judgements they made about the source • relied on pre-prepared judgements of evidence such as “photos are unreliable”.
General comments	<p>Most candidates seemed to be prepared to respond to questions on the context of ‘significance/relevance/importance of history’ as signalled in the Assessment Specifications. However, many candidates were unable to respond to and develop an argument for the actual question they chose to answer. They should clearly respond to the question chosen incorporating the key ideas related to the context specified. They should not write a pre-prepared response to the Specifications themselves or to another question that they might have answered during the year. Many candidates seemed to be unprepared to include their own content knowledge in their response.</p> <p>Candidates should be careful when making generalisations about groups of people/countries that verge on prejudicial judgements rather than balanced historical details.</p> <p>The Assessment Specifications had clearly signaled the need to include content knowledge from at least one topic of study. Candidates need to be able to unpack and analyse the sources provided in order to understand the key ideas that can be applied to their argument and to identify the origin of the sources which is important for their judgements. They are better to use less sources and use them well. They only have to use six sources. The different sources within one Source comprise one source i.e. if a candidate uses Source A1 and Source A2, they have used two sources. Candidates with good content knowledge write more effectively than candidates who rely on rote learnt quotes and theories about history.</p> <p>Candidates were restricted by their inability to judge sources and critique historians’ narratives.</p>