

# **Scholarship**

## **2012 Assessment Report**

### **History**

## COMMENTARY

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, which was not done well by candidates. Many of the sources should have been familiar to candidates but this was not evident in their critique and use of them. The [Assessment Specifications](#) defined the topic of the paper but there was no improvement in the way candidates used the source material in relation to their arguments, in fact most students did not go beyond the source material. The topic was general and candidates could have used any aspect of the topic as the basis of their argument. This should have enabled them to bring in adequate detail. This should have also enabled candidates to critique historians and judge sources knowledgeably but Skills 2 and 3 were weak in 2012.

The planning pages were useful, however some candidates spent too long planning and other candidates made no attempt to plan.

## 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 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 key idea – in terms of content knowledge as well as understanding of historiography and the nature of evidence
- had in depth knowledge and understanding of the whole period of study. Brought in a lot of their own knowledge to their argument which was accurate and detailed
- showed very effectively through this knowledge an explicit understanding of the relationship of past and present
- argued their case in a sophisticated and coherent way using the sources and their own content knowledge effectively
- 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, 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 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
- understood 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, substantiated key points and wrote a conclusion
- 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
- argued a case strongly using the sources and their own knowledge
- consistently communicated a clear, accurate argument
- integrated the sources well with their own content knowledge and argument
- had knowledge and understanding of the whole period of the topic of study
- 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, 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 and based on their informed knowledge of the topic, they 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 or Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:**

- failed to write a clear introduction that presented their own argument
- used the key idea as their introduction without any attempt to write it into their own words or apply it to an argument
- 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 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

- lacked knowledge of key details, essential to the building of an argument
- 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
- did not write a formal response. Used subheadings and/or bullet points
- 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.