



NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

Scholarship, 2004

History (93403)

National Statistics

Assessment Report

Assessment Schedule

History, Scholarship, 2004

General Comments

This examination tested the historical skills and understanding of the top history students. As such, it was a complex examination, which stretched the best candidates in regard to their analytical, critical thinking, evaluation, and reflective skills. The best candidates showed flair, innovation, and flexible thinking, and displayed an outstanding understanding of historical content. Their writing was original and sophisticated, with an excellent degree of literacy.

Students were expected to go beyond the resources supplied; the question clearly stated that students were to use their own knowledge as well as the resources, and students who did not do this disqualified themselves from the opportunity to gain Scholarship.

National Statistics

Number of Results	Percentage		
	Not Achieved	Scholarship	Outstanding
263	70.3%	24.0%	5.7%

Assessment Report

Candidates who achieved Scholarship provided more than a narrative of events. They showed a very clear understanding of the historical events, but went beyond this by incorporating argument and evaluation of perspectives, plus commentary on the reliability of the evidence provided. This was done in a coherent manner throughout the writing, rather than splitting the answer into narrative and evaluative sections. Reference to the sources was precise and to the point, rather than weighing an answer down with large and rambling quotations.

Scholarship candidates showed that they had a clear and defined argument from the beginning of their writing. There was a clear direction to their writing, with the development of a logical and sequential argument.

These candidates took heed of the instruction to cover a large number of the sources, rather than concentrate on just one or two, and showed a readiness to challenge historians and evidence that contradicted the argument they were presenting. These candidates showed a pleasing degree of confidence in articulating their own views, and carried this confidence into their conclusions, where they finished strongly with a summary that provided a clear reminder of how the writing had proved the argument established at the outset.

The successful Scholarship candidate showed a very high standard of spelling, punctuation and literacy.

The Outstanding Scholarship candidate showed evidence of careful planning of their argument, and then structured their article around an argument that was very clearly defined at the start, reiterated throughout, and then strongly reinforced in a mature and sophisticated conclusion. While their historical knowledge was at the highest level, these candidates impressed with their perception in evaluating the sources provided, and the strong reasoning and supportive evidence they used when challenging the historians cited in the resource pack.

Candidates at this advanced level used only very brief quotations from the sources, and then only when it was highly relevant to the point being made. The literacy skills of these candidates were outstanding.

Assessment Schedule

Scholarship History (93403)

Topic One: England 1558–1667

Clearly defines the scope and focus of the task.

The scholarship candidate will show a clear understanding of the task requirements. He/she will show that he/she is familiar with the changing nature of the debate on the abilities of both Elizabeth I and James I and will bring evidence from his/her own knowledge, as well as the resources, to support his/her own argument on the abilities and effectiveness of both monarchs.

Candidates will need to:

1. respond to the view expressed in the quotation, and establish his/her own argument concerning the abilities and effectiveness of both monarchs
2. support his/her argument with relevant and accurate historical information
3. evaluate the evidence available to historians
4. evaluate historians' interpretations of the abilities and effectiveness of both monarchs
5. establish his/her own reasoned conclusions about the abilities and effectiveness of both monarchs
6. follow an appropriate historical format, with a clear introduction, a series of sequentially-presented paragraphs, and a reasoned conclusion.

Communicate an historical argument that is substantiated by the use of accurate historical evidence.

- A scholarship candidate will be able to advance clearly, fluently, and logically his/her own argument about the abilities and effectiveness of both Elizabeth I and James I. A candidate who argues that Elizabeth had a wide range of abilities and was the more effective of the two monarchs would be expected to draw on and develop the arguments presented in Sources B and C, and show a clear understanding of the visual in Source E relating to Elizabeth. Such a candidate would also be expected to show an understanding of Source D. This candidate would also be expected to negate some of the arguments contained in Sources A, G, and I. Any such argument would have to be supported by detailed, accurate, and relevant information from the candidate's own knowledge.
- A candidate who argues that James was the more effective ruler would be expected to expand on Sources G and I, while logically negating the arguments contained in Sources F and J. Reference would need to be made to Source H, and James's emphasis on divine right. This candidate would also be expected to be able to counter the idea of Elizabeth's greatness.
- It is possible that a candidate might wish to advance an argument in which both are seen to have their abilities and to be effective rulers within specific time frames of each reign. This is acceptable, so long as clear explanations of why this occurred are provided.

Refers to at least EIGHT of the sources provided, links those sources to the historical argument, shows an awareness of historical interpretations, and shows an understanding of the nature of historical evidence.

The scholarship candidate will refer to at least EIGHT of the sources provided. These sources should be linked to the argument provided by the candidate.

This could include recognition of:

- bias within some of the sources
- limitations of some evidence
- appropriateness of the selection of sources
- reliability of the sources
- changes over time in the research process
- the weighing-up of evidence.

The scholarship candidate might:

- comment on the need for more specific evidence from the source selection; eg specific details about foreign policy, or Crown / Parliament debates
- discuss the nature of evidence; eg the Weldon source is acknowledged as being written by a man resentful of James and who disliked Scots, the clear bias shown in the visual relating to Elizabeth, and why such bias occurred
- comment in particular about the 'revisionist' nature of history writing, with particular reference to James I.

Shows understanding of some historical relationships.

The scholarship candidate will show an awareness of historical relationships. These could include relationships such as cause and effect, past and present, specific and general, continuity and change, and patterns and trends. This awareness could be illustrated by reference to some of the sources, eg C, D, G, or it could develop from the candidate's own knowledge, eg James's pacific foreign policy in part sprang from his chronic shortage of necessary funding.

Appropriate structure, format, and proper use of historical conventions.

Scholarship candidates are expected to express their ideas fluently, logically, and succinctly, in a style appropriate for an article. Their work must show an appropriate historical format, with a clear introduction, a series of sequentially-presented paragraphs, and a sophisticated conclusion where all points of the argument are drawn together into a coherent whole.

Language is to be appropriate, with accurate grammar, spelling, and punctuation.

The use of appropriate historical conventions, such as names, dates, and references, is expected.

Assessment Schedule for Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding scholarship candidates will be those who think 'outside the square', and who have a complex and original understanding and appreciation of the topic. The ideas in their article will be sophisticated and perceptive. They will:

- effectively communicate sophisticated, substantiated argument
- develop informed and perceptive judgements about the nature of historical evidence and /or historical research
- critically evaluate historical narratives
- demonstrate a thorough and perceptive understanding of historical relationships in the context of the debate over the abilities and effectiveness of Elizabeth I and James I
- synthesise, with perception and insight, ideas relevant to the topic
- demonstrate an understanding of the critical underpinnings and scope of the topic.

Topic Two: New Zealand in the Nineteenth Century

Clearly defines the scope and focus of the task.

The scholarship candidate will show a clear understanding of the task requirements. He/she will show that he/she is familiar with the atomisation / community debate and bring evidence from his/her own knowledge, as well as the sources provided to support his/her argument.

Candidates will need to:

1. respond to the view expressed in the quotation, and establish his/her own argument concerning the nature of Pākehā community in nineteenth-century New Zealand
2. support his/her argument with relevant and accurate historical information
3. evaluate the evidence available to historians
4. evaluate historians' interpretations of Pākehā community in the nineteenth century
5. establish his/her own reasoned conclusions about the nature of Pākehā community in nineteenth-century New Zealand
6. follow an appropriate historical format, with a clear introduction, a series of sequentially-presented paragraphs, and a reasoned conclusion.

Communicate an historical argument that is substantiated by the use of accurate historical evidence.

- The Scholarship candidate will be able to advance clearly, fluently, and logically her/his own argument in favour of the atomisation thesis, against it, or make an argument (possibly drawing on Source J) that presents some sort of third way.
- A scholarship candidate arguing in favour of atomisation will be able to describe the causes and consequences of atomisation that Fairburn outlines and draw on evidence from Fairburn himself (both Sources A and B), national statistics about sex ratios, and his/her own knowledge. He/she will also have to deal to the counter arguments contained in the resources, possibly dismissing them as being too specific (Sources G and H), too general (Source F), and lacking in substantial evidence (Source C).
- A candidate arguing against the atomisation thesis could point out the importance of regional statistics and draw on evidence from Sources G, H, and I. They might point out the importance of women (as agents of settlement), families, and Māori to New Zealand society.

Refers to at least EIGHT of the sources provided, links those sources to the historical argument, shows awareness of historical interpretations, and shows an understanding of the nature of historical evidence.

The scholarship candidate will refer to at least EIGHT of the sources provided. These sources should be linked to the argument presented by the candidate.

This could include recognition of:

- bias within some of the sources
- limitations of some evidence
- appropriateness of the selection of sources
- reliability of the sources
- changes over time in the research process
- the weighing-up of evidence.

The Scholarship candidate might:

- comment on the need for more evidence for atomisation from the source selection provided. Fairburn provides plenty of statistics which he claims point to unsettlement. Many of these concern violence, litigiousness, and binge drinking.
- comment that many of the criticisms of atomisation provided in the resources (especially Mackay and Daley) are too specific to undercut Fairburn's broad thesis. Conversely, Phillips and Oliver (his article pre-dates Fairburn's book) might be seen to be too reliant on anecdotal generalisation.
- discuss the nature of evidence. Historical records are often biased in the way that they reflect the history of those who stay put. As Belich has said, there is a "tendency of community history to exaggerate its own lumping power – myths of cohesion in the past encourage actual cohesion in the present".

- draw on the Australian example or those of other frontier societies and explain that the New Zealand situation is much less remarkable than Fairburn has argued.
- use Source B as a case study supporting the argument for atomisation, or use Source I, which provides plenty of evidence against atomisation and the impact of chain migration and the predominance of family groups in migration to New Zealand in the 1870s.
- point out that Fairburn simply ignores the 1840s – a period that could be seen as crucial to the formation of community.
- discuss the relative strengths and weaknesses of oral history and literary evidence over statistical evidence.

Shows understanding of some historical relationships.

The scholarship candidate will show an awareness of historical relationships. These could include relationships such as cause and effect, past and present, specific and general, continuity and change, and pattern and trends. All these historical relationships are apparent in this debate.

- A scholarship candidate might make the connection between migration and atomization, or chain migration with community.
- There is ample scope for discussion about the relationship 'specific and general', regarding the Kauri Bushmen, residents of Taradale, and the case studies in relation to the creation of a national picture of community, or lack of it.
- The analysis of statistics provides plenty of scope for discussing the significance of regional and urban statistics compared to national statistics in this argument.
- The scholarship candidate may well ask if transience necessarily equates to atomisation.

Appropriate structure, format, and proper use of historical conventions.

Scholarship candidates are expected to express their ideas fluently, logically and succinctly, in a style appropriate for an article. Their work must show an appropriate historical format, with a clear introduction, a series of sequentially-presented paragraphs, and a sophisticated conclusion where all points of the argument are drawn together in a coherent whole.

Language is to be appropriate, with accurate grammar, spelling, and punctuation.

The use of appropriate historical conventions, such as names, dates, and references, is expected.

Assessment Schedule for Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding scholarship students will be those who think 'outside the square', and who have a complex and original understanding and appreciation of the topic.

The ideas in their article will be both sophisticated and perceptive.

They will:

- effectively communicate sophisticated, substantiated argument
- develop informed and perceptive judgements about the nature of historical evidence and /or historical research
- critically evaluate historical narratives
- demonstrate a thorough and perceptive understanding of historical relationships in the context of the atomisation debate
- synthesise, with perception and insight, ideas relevant to the topic
- demonstrate an understanding of the critical underpinnings and scope of the topic.