

Scholarship

2010 Assessment Report

History

COMMENTARY

The 2010 Scholarship History paper was completed very well by those who attained Outstanding Scholarship and Scholarship. The quality of the responses from these candidates was very high. Candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the questions asked for both topics and used the sources provided effectively. They demonstrated an excellent understanding of the content for each of the topics and knowledge of the historical narrative related to those topics. These candidates were also able to critically evaluate historical narratives and judge historical sources. It was clear that they had been taught how to structure their response, critique narratives and judge sources. These candidates planned well.

There was a significant gap between the quality of the responses of those candidates who attained Scholarship and those who did not. Amongst those candidates who did not attain Scholarship there were many who demonstrated a strong understanding of the content, knowledge of the historical narrative and an ability to write a convincing argument. However, these candidates were unable to critique historical narratives or to judge historical sources. Candidates must be prepared for each of the skills that pertain to the Scholarship Performance Criteria. The Scholarship Criteria can be downloaded from the NZQA website.

The majority of candidates who did not attain Scholarship were unable to develop a logical argument and failed to organise their ideas into a structured narrative. These candidates had little or no knowledge of historical narrative on the topics, could not critique the views of historians and were unable to judge the sources provided. These candidates did not plan their response.

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 which was accurate and detailed and were able to discuss change/continuity within Elizabeth's reign/Vogel's leadership and the impact of their decisions
- showed very effectively through this knowledge an explicit understanding of the relationships of cause and effect
- 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, 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, 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.

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
- 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 and were able to discuss change/continuity within Elizabeth's reign/Vogel's involvement in politics and the impact of their decisions
- showed very effectively through this knowledge an explicit understanding of the relationships of cause and effect
- 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, 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 understand the chronology of the period – arguments are rarely successful if knowledge of chronology is lacking
- failed to 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, 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
- failed to look for key details about a source – e.g. identifying reliability from the title or reference of a source
- lacked fundamental knowledge about issues such as:
the nature of personal monarchy; the nature of the archaic state; divine right and the hierarchical nature of society; the differences between parliament and the court; the difference between favourites and ministers; the roles of Elizabeth's advisors; how Elizabeth dealt with her parliaments; nature of gender and succession – Mary Tudor her sister had already been Queen so it was not so unusual to have another Queen.; how/when the cult of Gloriana was introduced and with what effects; the nature of succession for a monarch (male or female); the changes in the 45 years of Elizabeth's reign; the impact of the Religious Settlement beyond 1559; the difference between events in Ireland and her foreign policy
New Zealand's fundamental economic problems; the 'boom and bust' cycle in the 1860s; provincialism and the abolition of the provinces, Vogel's Plan; the nature of organised immigration schemes beyond those of the Wakefield Company; political economic and social responses to the recession; the legacy of Vogel in terms of Liberal Party policy and legislation
- became stuck on the exciting personal story of Elizabeth/Vogel but failed to make this relevant to the question
- 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.