

HOW TO ATTACK THE SCHOLARSHIP HISTORY EXAM

Wellington Area History Teachers'
Association

*Ministry for Culture and Heritage
Tuesday 6th September, 2010*



Outline

- Stats – What are my chances of getting a scholarship?
- Where do I find the resources for scholarship?
- Marking grid – How does the marking work?
- What's in the assessment schedule's fine print?
- How do I organise the three hours?
- How do I structure an answer?
- What does a top script look like?
- AOB

It's not as hard as you think...

2009 Cohort (Level 3)	% of scholarships including "Outstanding"	Scholarships	Outstanding
5587	2.99%	147	20

- Approx. 1000 candidates...
 - 1/6 chance
- Very high absentee rate...
 - 1/5 chance
- High attrition rate
 - 1/3 chance

Finding Scholarship Resources

NZQA
NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY
TAHIA TOHU, PAKAUKAURI O AOTEAROA

SITE MAP | CONTACT US | LOGIN

HOME | STUDYING IN NEW ZEALAND | QUALIFICATIONS & STANDARDS | MĀORI | PROVIDERS & PARTNERS | ABOUT US | SEARCH

Search **GO**

This website Qualifications Unit Standards NCEA Education organisations

Study in New Zealand

Find out about the New Zealand education system and qualifications framework. [Learn more >](#)

Qualifications & standards

Detailed qualification and standards information covering NCEA and tertiary study. [Learn more >](#)

Providers & partners

Information for the education industry to help you work with NZQA. [Learn more >](#)

Haere mai - Welcome to NZQA

Hello, Tēnā koutou, Kia orana, Fakaalofa lahi atu, Talofa lava, Gude tru olgeta, Taloha ni, Malo e lelei, Ni sa bula vinaka, Kia ora tātou.

NZQA ensures that New Zealand qualifications are valued as credible and robust both nationally and internationally.

Te manu ka kai i te miro, nōna te ngahere. Te manu ka kai i te mātauranga, nōna te ao.

The bird that partakes of the berry, his is the forest. The bird that partakes of knowledge, his is the world.

NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORK

Explore the definitive list of New Zealand Qualifications. [Read more >](#)

NCEA

A comprehensive guide to NCEA. [Read more >](#)

SIGN UP FOR EMAIL UPDATES

Email updates and newsletters. [Sign up now >](#)

News

[Read all >](#)

The Compatibility of Qualifications in Ireland and New Zealand launched
05 August 2010 [Read more >](#)

Quality assurance criteria for unit standards
The Quality assurance criteria for the listing of unit standards on the Directory of Assessment Standards has replaced the Registration Criteria for National Qualifications Framework (NQF) Unit Standards.
30 July 2010 [Read more >](#)

Consultations & Reviews

Improving performance in tertiary education: using quality assurance incentives and sanctions >
Closes 8 Sep 2010

INFORMATION FOR...

- [Secondary schools & teachers >](#)
- [Private Training Establishments >](#)
- [Students >](#)
- [Standard Setting Bodies >](#)
- [Pasifika >](#)
- [Tertiary tutors >](#)
- [International >](#)
- [Māori >](#)

School students and parents

- [Understanding NCEA >](#)
- [Get my results >](#)
- [Scholarships >](#)
- [Search NCEA standards >](#)
- [School statistics >](#)
- [Subject specific resources >](#)
- [Examination timetable >](#)

About NZQA

- [What we do >](#)
- [Consultations & Reviews >](#)
- [News >](#)
- [Working at NZQA >](#)

I want to...

- [Submit tertiary learner results >](#)
- [Register as a new provider >](#)
- [Study for NZ Dip Bus >](#)
- [Get my results >](#)
- [Search for a qualification >](#)
- [Come to NZ to study >](#)
- [Qualify for UE >](#)

It's in the fine print...

Skill #1 – Argument

1. Candidates whose arguments are **sophisticated** (8 or 7 marks) could have demonstrated this through literacy, fluency, insight, elegance, flair, discernment, complexity and / or originality.
2. A candidate will have effectively communicated a **substantiated argument** with a solid argument consistently supported by evidence from the sources and / or their own knowledge (6 marks). A candidate whose argument wavers or drifts in places is likely to gain 5 marks.
3. A candidate who has communicated a relatively simple argument that is not always supported by evidence, or where the argument is in the background rather than explicit, should be awarded a mark of 4.
4. A candidate who is awarded 2 marks has made an attempt to communicate an argument or has written a competent accurate narrative.

It's in the fine print...

Skill #4 – Historical Relationships

1. A candidate can demonstrate their understanding of historical relationships either implicitly or explicitly. Markers should use the mark given to the candidate for ***argument*** as a guide to their marking of this skill.

It's in the fine print...

Skill #5 – Synthesis of Ideas

1. A candidate who gains 7 or 8 marks for this skill should provide an insightful and ***perceptive integration*** of ideas from their own knowledge and the sources provided in order to enhance their ***argument***.
2. A candidate who gains 6 or 5 marks is likely to have brought in ***plenty of accurate and relevant detail*** from their own knowledge and integrated this appropriately into their ***argument***.
3. A candidate gaining either 4 marks or 3 marks is likely to have brought in a little bit of their own knowledge (although this might not always be directly relevant to the argument – more of a side track) and / or have provided some decent paraphrasing of the sources into their article. Candidates who take a source-by-source approach, and don't integrate the evidence from the sources into a well-structured argument, will fall into this category (at best) as they will not have demonstrated the skill of synthesis needed for PD2.
4. A candidate gaining either 1 or 2 marks would either fail to use any / much of their own knowledge or make little or no reference to the sources provided.

It's in the fine print...

Skill #3 – Evaluating Historical Narratives

1. A candidate who gains 7 or 8 marks will need to, **consistently** throughout their article, make **judgements** about historical narratives and **explain why they have made these judgements**. To reach this category, these judgements would need to show an insightful understanding about the nature of the issue or the perspective of the historian and / or the contemporary. This evaluation needs to be sustained.
2. The key word for a mark of either 5 or 6 is "**critical**". A candidate gaining a mark in this category would need to make judgements about historical narratives and **explain why they have made these judgements**. In order for the candidate to reach this category, these judgements would need to show an insightful understanding about the nature of the issue or perspective of the historian / contemporary.
3. A candidate will be deemed to have evaluated historical narratives if he or she has correctly and accurately used the views of historians and / or contemporaries in his / her argument and has made some simple judgements about the validity of these views. This would include using the views of one historian / contemporary to evaluate another. A candidate would have to make several of these simple judgments in order to gain a mark of 4 (or have fewer but stronger evaluative points).
4. A candidate who gains either 2 marks (at least one genuine attempt) or 1 mark (a glimmer!) has to have attempted to make an evaluative comment about the views of historians and / or contemporaries concerning the historical issue.

It's in the fine print...

Skill #2 – Judgements about Evidence/Research

1. A candidate who gains 8 or 7 marks will be both ***informed and perceptive***. Perceptive comments will stand out to the marker and are likely to show not just an understanding of the issue from what they have been taught (informed) but also an understanding of the critical underpinnings of the process of historical research and study. What evidence is not available to historians either now or in the past?
2. A candidate who gains 5 or 6 marks will be ***informed***. This means that their judgements [plural] need to be accurate and based on their informed knowledge of the historical issue.
3. A candidate who is awarded either 3 or 4 marks will have made some simple or obvious but valid judgements [more than one] about the nature of the historical evidence available to them as they address the historical issue. They are likely to use phrases such as "***limitation***", "***reliability***", "***validity***", "***usefulness***", "***bias***", "***propaganda***", "***selection***", "***appropriate***", "***representative***" etc (also applicable above and below). A candidate gaining a 4 is likely to have made more of these sorts of low-level judgements than a candidate gaining 3.
4. A candidate who gains either 2 marks (at least one genuine attempt) or 1 mark (a glimmer!) must have attempted to make a judgement about the nature of the historical evidence available to them as they address the historical issue.

It's in the fine print...

Skill #6 – Understanding of question/context

1. Markers should use the marks that the candidate has been awarded for **skills 1, 4 and 5** and to a lesser extent skills 2 and 3 as a guide for their marking of skill 6. How well does the candidate understand the issue they have been discussing? Is there ***breadth, depth and balanced coverage***?

The first hour

1. Critical reading
2. Organising your argument
3. Highlighting evidence which supports your argument in one colour
4. Highlighting evidence which runs against your argument in another colour
5. Annotating resources with judgements of historical evidence and narratives
"limitation", "reliability", "validity", "usefulness", "bias", "propaganda", "selection", "appropriate", "representative"...
6. What's not in these sources which could contribute to my argument?

Structuring a simple argument

1. Introduction is crucial – It must explicitly state your argument
2. Engaging with evidence in the sources which runs against your argument. (This section should be stacked full with judgements about narratives and evidence)
3. Presenting evidence which supports your argument (This section will be littered with judgments about narratives and evidence)
4. Conclusion



Signposting

Keeping the argument at the forefront of the article at all times...

- “This article argues that...”
- “We have already seen...”
- “So far this article has shown that...”
- “Having shown that.... this article now goes on...”
- “This final section of this paper continues the argument that.... by...”
- “This article has argued...”

Student Answer

...prepare an article for a history journal in which you analyse the extent to which the Treaty of Waitangi played a pivotal role in the development of New Zealand's sense of nationhood by 1900.

- Prominence of argument throughout
- Extensive use of own knowledge (especially historiography)
- Engagement with historical narratives and other source material