

Scholarship

2011 Assessment Report

History

COMMENTARY

The Assessment Specifications defined the topic of the paper; however, many candidates did not use the source material effectively in relation to their arguments. Most candidates did not go beyond the source material and did bring in a great amount of their own related knowledge / detail. Candidates who were awarded Scholarship did critique historians and judge sources knowledgeably.

The paper contained a range of sources that covered the key historical narratives as well as a variety of interesting and valuable primary source material that collectively made the paper accessible and straightforward for well-prepared candidates to construct their response from. The range of sources allowed candidates to cover each of the skills assessed including judging the sources. Many of the sources should have been familiar to candidates but this was not evident in their critique and use of them. Planning pages appeared to be used well; however, in a few cases, candidates appeared to spend too much time planning.

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 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
- structured their response effectively and with 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
- 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
- responded with a great deal of confidence to the key idea – in terms of content knowledge as well as understanding of historiography and the nature of evidence
- brought in a lot of their own knowledge that was accurate and detailed and discussed cause and effect in relation to the Reformation and its impact on popular beliefs as well as underlying forces such as the rise of literacy and developments in science and technology. New Zealand candidates were able to discuss cause and effect in relation to the impact of values, fears, and beliefs of migrants on New Zealand's economy, politics, and society by 1900
- showed very effectively through this knowledge an explicit understanding of the relationship of change and continuity – how much popular beliefs remained important in Early Modern England or how much the shape of New Zealand society changed as a result of migrants' values, fears, and beliefs
- demonstrated their knowledge of the key historians and arguments by integrating accurate and relevant historians' interpretations that were not provided in the sources into their argument
- critiqued and evaluated historians' interpretations as presented in the sources and from their own knowledge in relation to their argument
- used quotations of contemporaries that were very appropriate as well as short quotations from historians that were not included in the paper

- judged the validity, reliability, and usefulness of source material in relation to the question and their argument. These judgements were accurate. Based on their informed knowledge of the topic, candidates demonstrated an understanding of the issue based on their content knowledge but also an understanding of the critical underpinnings of the process of historical research and study
- showed very effectively through this knowledge an explicit understanding of the relationships of cause and effect and continuity and change.

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
- showed understanding of the scope of the question
- structured their response effectively – writing an introduction that was concise and paragraphs that began with topic sentences and were related to the argument put forward in the introduction
- responded to the key idea – bringing in their own content knowledge and demonstrating an understanding of historiography and the nature of evidence on the topic
- brought in a lot of their own knowledge to discuss cause and effect in relation to the Reformation and its impact on popular beliefs as well as underlying forces such as the rise of literacy and developments in science and technology. New Zealand candidates discussed cause and effect in relation to the impact of values, fears, and beliefs of migrants on New Zealand's economy, politics, and society by 1900
- showed very effectively through this knowledge an understanding of the relationship of change and continuity – how much popular beliefs remained important in Early Modern England or how the shape of New Zealand society changed as a result of migrants' fears, beliefs, and values
- consistently communicated a clear, accurate argument
- integrated the sources well with their own content knowledge and argument
- demonstrated their knowledge of the key historians and arguments by integrating accurate and relevant historians' interpretations that were not provided in the sources into their argument
- critiqued and 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. These judgements were accurate. Based on their informed knowledge of the topic, candidates demonstrated an understanding of the issue based on their content knowledge but also an understanding of the critical underpinnings of the process of historical research and study.

OTHER CANDIDATES

Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship typically:

- did not understand the chronology of the period – arguments are rarely successful if knowledge of chronology is lacking
- did not 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
- 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 beyond a paraphrasing of the sources or made no reference to the sources
- displayed insufficient knowledge of key details, essential to the building of an argument
- England candidates showed a lack of fundamental knowledge about issues such as the nature of religion and popular beliefs; what the Reformation was and that it was not the same as the 1559 Settlement; definitions of key terms such as popular beliefs; values & fears; the distinction between Christianity and popular beliefs; Roman Catholic calendar and changes to the Protestant calendar. New Zealand candidates showed a lack of fundamental knowledge about the different types of migrants who came to New Zealand in the nineteenth century and their experiences and the nature of politics and the economy and the impact of each of these on society by 1900
- England candidates ignored the reference to values and fears in the question and key idea and discussed 'beliefs' only. New Zealand candidates wrote about 'values' only
- wrote simplistic accounts about the character of New Zealand migrants and argued that these traits apply to all New Zealanders today. Wrote emotively about the virtues of migrant to New Zealanders rather than analyse the nature of society and what forces / people shaped it
- 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 (many 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
- did not look for key details about a source – e.g. Identifying reliability from the title or reference of a source.

OTHER COMMENTS

Candidates were restricted by their inability to address Skills 2 and 3 in an effective way; although some candidates might write an appropriate or even convincing argument and thus score 4 or 5 for Skills 1, 4, 5, 6, they will not score more than 1 for Skills 2 and 3.

Candidates must recognise the author of a source and not the author of the book the source was cited from and should not write out the citation. They also need to look at the date of a source, as this is important in questioning the reliability of a source. England candidates needed to go beyond the sources for information – sources such as the one showing King Charles II and the Touching of the King's Evil and The Tichbourne Dole should have prompted candidates to look beyond the obvious popular belief being portrayed and to comment on social and political values and fears. Sources such as the ones showing the Chinese migrants and the Wakefield settlements should have prompted New Zealand candidates to look beyond the obvious value or fear being portrayed and to comment more broadly on social, political, and economic beliefs. Most importantly, 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.