



NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

Assessment Report

Scholarship, 2006

History

History, Scholarship, 2006

Commentary

Scholarship candidates are required to display an integrated response that applies the six skills in one piece of work rather than compartmentalising them into separate answers.

The ability to synthesise ideas, show understanding of historical relationships and contextual issues, make judgments about evidence and / or research, evaluate historical narratives and present a critical argument must be evident in candidates' answers.

The best candidates demonstrated flair, literacy, use of evidence, and the ability to critically evaluate the views of historians and the evidence available to them. They were adept at selecting their argument and integrating evidence from their own knowledge with evidence from the resources to construct their argument.

In 2006, candidates were given the opportunity to select from a wide range of resources and create their argument using a more general key idea to guide them. Rather than candidates being given a specific key idea that they could either agree or disagree with, they were asked to construct an argument that offered several alternative ways to do this. Many candidates found it difficult to select and sustain a tight focus for their argument.

Many candidates appeared to spend too much time working with the sources and consequently they ran out of time. The instructions required candidates to use evidence from at least seven of the sources provided, and to integrate their own knowledge into their answer.

Overall, the top candidates answering the New Zealand option exhibited much more knowledge of historiography than candidates answering the England option.

The best performing candidates most commonly demonstrated the following skills and/or knowledge:

- ability to construct an historical argument that was sophisticated, well written and supported by evidence and to sustain this argument throughout their article rather than drifting off into sidetracks
- ability to use knowledge that they could integrate with the evidence from the sources into their argument
- ability to integrate into their argument appropriate references to the views of historians, and to critique the views of these historians, evaluating the evidence on which they based their views
- ability to demonstrate understanding and knowledge over the entire timeframe of the question, and to stick to the boundaries that the question put in place
- ability to make critical and informed judgments about the nature of historical evidence beyond obvious and generic comments about bias and reliability.

Candidates who did NOT achieve scholarship lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge above and in addition they:

- drifted into a narrative approach
- made no or little reference to historical narratives
- made no attempt, or made low level generic type attempts, to make judgements about historical narratives
- relied on a large amount of paraphrasing of the sources, or paid no reference to the source material at all
- "toured the sources" rather than structuring their article into a tight argument.