Assessment Report

Level 1 History 2017

Standards 91003  91005  91006

Part A: Commentary

Overall candidates who were well prepared, planned their responses and applied their knowledge of historical thinking skills performed well.

For 91005 and 91006 those candidates who were successful responded to the question posed and applied well-chosen content that was suitable to the standard and the question.

Topics that work well for internal assessments do not always allow candidates to demonstrate a comprehensive understanding for both 91005 and 91006. Natural and some man-made disasters do not lend themselves to be suitable topics to demonstrate in-depth or comprehensive description.

For 91005 and 91006, choosing a specific event or ‘turning point’ within a wider topic also made it easier for candidates to demonstrate their understanding; for example, the Gallipoli Campaign, rather than WW1.

Part B: Report on standards

91003: Interpret sources of an historical event of significance to New Zealanders

Candidates who were awarded Achievement commonly:

• wrote responses that used a limited amount of evidence to support of their answer
• demonstrated a limited understanding of usefulness and reliability.

Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:

• answered only one part of question
• provided insufficient relevant evidence to address the questions
• copied out large extracts from the sources, which didn’t address the question
• showed limited or no understanding
• answered only one or two of the questions
• responded with irrelevant information.
Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- addressed all parts of the question and wrote responses that demonstrated depth for at least two of the questions
- demonstrated an understanding of perspectives, usefulness and reliability
- utilised evidence within their answers and made links within the evidence in order to support their responses
- responded to questions with structured answers and in their own words.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- addressed all questions. Answers were typically extensive with detailed discussions on multiple points of interest, especially concerning limitations of evidence
- responded using a wide range of relevant historical evidence
- planned their answers in a logical sequence
- wrote clear responses that concisely answered the question
- made insightful observations which were relevant to the question.

**Standard specific comments**

A wide range of sources was made available and candidates who were confident in using the variety of sources were rewarded. Those candidates who had been exposed to describing the usefulness and reliability of a range of sources were generally rewarded in Question 3.

---

**91005: Describe the causes and consequences of an historical event**

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- demonstrated links to the event but fairly weak or lacking in evidence or explanation
- provided little or no detail to support their essay
- provided a straightforward description
- attempted to use evidence, but this was often limited and lacked depth and development
- demonstrated elements of a narrative; causes and consequences were often within the text rather than the focus for separate paragraphs
- wrote an essay that was structured, but often lacked historical sequence.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- wrote a straight narrative of the event, making no causal connections
- described only the causes or only the consequences
- selected and used evidence that was not relevant to the causes/consequences of the event or was incorrect
- wrote a response that was usually unstructured and often incoherent
- did not clearly identify a well-defined historical event.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- wrote a clear, structured essay with detailed evidence to support their generalisations
- chose a clearly-defined event
- described two causes and two consequences consistently in depth and clearly linked to the event.
• used an appropriate essay structure with clear introductions and conclusions and sensible paragraphing.

Candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence commonly:

• used a comprehensive level of supporting evidence that explicitly linked, in a precise manner, the causes and consequences to the event. Made accurate use of chronology, statistics, dates, personalities etc. Primary evidence, such as this, was woven throughout the essay and supported the essay
• chose an event that had very clear causes and consequences that linked with each other
• wrote an essay which had a logical structure with lots of supporting evidence and quotes incorporated into it
• wrote an essay which had a balanced consistency and depth across the causes and consequences
• demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of their chosen historical event by showing the interrelationship between causes.

Standard specific comments

A succinct, single paragraph description of the event itself is desirable, but candidates do not need to write several paragraphs about the event. It is important that candidates make connections between the causes, the event and the consequences.

91006: Describe how a significant historical event affected New Zealanders

Candidates who were awarded Achievement commonly:

• correctly identified an event of significance to New Zealand and could provide some limited information on the background to the event
• mentioned a couple of key events linking to the background, but the evidence supporting this was limited or incorrect
• correctly identified two different people and groups who were related to their chosen historical event. In most cases they could correctly identify one specific action that each of the groups or people took during the chosen event
• may have written an action that occurred outside of the event
• made some attempt to try and describe how the event was significant either at the time or since
• used limited or historically inaccurate evidence to support ideas.

Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:

• attempted only one or two of the questions
• described what happened during their chosen historical event with no mention on any of the events that were important to looking at the background of the historical event
• described one person or group who was involved in their chosen historical event and often the action was lacking in detail or linking to their event
• described people/groups chosen who were not suitable for the topic they had chosen
• wrote a vague description on why their chosen event was of significance to New Zealanders with very limited accurate historical evidence to support their description.

Candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit commonly:

• used specific, relevant and accurate examples and evidence to support their responses for each answer
• described in detail a number of events that occurred as background to their chosen historical event and used relevant evidence to support their ideas
• described some key background events and then focused on the events during the event itself
• attempted to look at both the New Zealand and the international historical context of their chosen historical event
• identified two different people and/or groups and could accurately describe in depth actions that the people/groups took. One of the actions may have been inaccurate for one group but the other three actions demonstrated an in-depth understanding
• described in depth why the event was significant at the time and used relevant historical evidence or examples to support their ideas and then describe how the event was significant now (or vice versa).

Candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence commonly:

• made links between the questions and used accurate, relevant and considered evidence to link specifically to the question
• focused on the events leading to the background, often establishing causation and stating explicitly why they were background to their events
• identified both international and national events that formed important background to their chosen event
• described actions in relation to their chosen event that were concise, well-detailed and covered the action comprehensively, with little or no repetition over the question
• wrote detailed responses on how the event was significant at the time and how it continues to be significant today
• used a wide range of relevant and specific historical examples and evidence to support their ideas.

Standard specific comments

Candidates were generally able to describe how the event was significant at the time, but struggled with explaining the relevance beyond 10 years after the event. Similarly, candidates could write generalised statements as to why an event is significant today but did not support these with specific evidence or examples.