

# Assessment Report

---

## On this page

[91231: Examine sources of an historical event that is of significance to New Zealanders](#) ▼

[91233: Examine causes and consequences of a significant historical event](#) ▼

[91234: Examine how a significant historical event affected New Zealand society](#) ▼

## Level 2 History 2018

Standards [91231](#) [91233](#) [91234](#)

## Part A: Commentary

Candidates have generally enhanced the application of their knowledge and understanding to the respective essay tasks. Development in the essay task for AS91233 has heightened the necessity for this. Candidates who achieved at the highest level for this achievement standard appeared to appreciate the opportunity to reflect an insightful understanding of their event and its causation.

Some candidates wrote essays that signalled via topic sentences, evidence, use of historiography, and the framework for their essays that they were 'pre-fabricated'. Candidates should note that applying knowledge to the key idea(s) of the essay task is fundamental to success. Further, the key idea(s), or foci, of the essay task will change in some way from year to year. This was evident with the use of 'trigger' in 2018.

Finally, the push for conducive events and concise, cogent essays appears to have been heard. Generally, the response of candidates gaining Achievement

with Excellence was written within the parameters of the booklet.

## Part B: Report on standards

# 91231: Examine sources of an historical event that is of significance to New Zealanders

---

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- wrote straightforward responses with a limited examination of sources, directly copying or paraphrasing sources
- referred to a source but did not explain specific information from the source to prove its relevance
- answered part of the question or failed to fully support their response with relevant evidence
- demonstrated some understanding of the context and the supporting evidence but provided a vague response that did not fully address the question
- responded in a narrative style, using a direct reference to sources without providing any supporting analysis.

Candidates whose work was assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- misinterpreted or misread the questions
- did not attempt or complete all of the questions,
- did not support their conclusions with valid and relevant evidence
- gave personal or emotive responses that were not based on evidence or specific to the resources
- did not attempt all three of the questions.

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

- addressed all three questions in some depth
- provided an explanation in their own words, using relevant supporting evidence
- engaged with the sources and demonstrated a sound understanding of the evidence
- examined both perspectives with equal depth and detail
- demonstrated an understanding of the reliability and usefulness of a source
- selected a range of sources to support their answers.

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

- demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of the sources as well as the key concepts in the questions
- understood the idea of context in relation to reliability and usefulness
- understood the limitations of sources and questioned the source providing insightful observations
- went beyond the obvious to draw intelligent conclusions
- provided comprehensive responses to all questions
- wrote in their own words, using relevant evidence, to form conclusions
- showed a high level of source interpretation skills
- provided an equally balanced response to all three questions.

### **Standard specific comments**

Candidates must closely read and respond to the task or question to foster a targeted response.

Some candidates wrote generic responses. They did not apply the concepts or ideas discussed in their response to the sources in the resource booklet.

When evaluating a source, candidates should go beyond the immediately obvious. Features like context, intended audience or purpose, corroboration, and inference can be considered.

---

# 91233: Examine causes and consequences of a significant historical event

---

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- addressed both parts of the question, providing at least two causes and two consequences
- made at least three historically valid points in support of each cause and consequence
- presented causes and consequences in chronological order
- did not clearly establish causation
- wrote in an essay structure.

Candidates whose work was assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- presented only one developed, substantiated cause and/or one developed, substantiated consequence of an event
- did not include sufficient evidence and explanation to meet the expectation of the achievement standard to 'examine'
- contained numerous historical errors or inaccuracies that detracted from the validity of the essay
- did not complete one of the two parts to the essay task
- did not write in an essay structure.

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

- explained the 'trigger' cause in full to establish strong causation
- used detailed, varied, and well-selected supporting evidence
- categorised causes and consequences
- made evaluative comments

- used topic sentences to effectively frame the cause or consequence being examined
- wrote at length and could have been more selective and succinct.

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

- convincingly addressed the question
- selected important and significant causes and consequences that were directly linked to the event
- incorporated significant and purposeful supporting evidence
- categorised causes and consequences as political, social, economic or the like, and insightfully evaluated them as such
- linked causes and consequences to demonstrate insight
- insightfully evaluated quotes and historiography
- insightfully contextualised the event
- demonstrated insightful understanding of in-depth content knowledge
- provided analytical explanation
- developed an argument throughout the essay
- wrote concisely, structuring the essay to facilitate evaluation and examination.

### **Standard specific comments**

The causes and consequences selected should be strongly linked to the event and have sufficient depth to provide opportunities for demonstrating higher level achievement criteria.

---

## **91234: Examine how a significant historical event affected New Zealand society**

---

### Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- examined an appropriate historical event that linked to the essay task
- provided relevant ideas and generalisations but used limited evidence to support their discussion
- reverted to a narrative account of their chosen historical event in parts, including the impact(s)
- did not respond directly to the essay task, examining the background and event with excessive depth and coverage
- wrote in an essay structure.

### Candidates whose work was assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- weighted their essay toward the background to the historical event, providing limited discussion relating to the effects on New Zealanders, or the essay task itself
- provided a narrative of an event, discussing causes and consequences, therefore, not responding to the essay task or Standard
- did not provide accurate historical evidence to support their discussion
- made major historical errors that detracted from the validity of the essay
- did not write in an essay structure.

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

- planned their response
- examined a well-defined topic that allowed an in-depth response
- responded to the key words of the essay task
- wrote a concise background to the event and an in-depth examination of the effects on New Zealanders
- made direct links to more than one social, political, economic, military/strategic factor
- supported their ideas with detailed, accurate, and relevant historical evidence that sufficiently enabled them to examine the effects on New Zealanders
- applied an effective essay structure, writing in a logical and well-organised manner.

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

- planned their response
- wrote a paper indicative of the weighting and focus of the essay task
- clearly and comprehensively explained the links between their event and effects on New Zealanders
- used a range of factors to demonstrate a comprehensive and insightful understanding of the effects that their chosen historical event had on New Zealand society
- employed several specific named examples of effects relating to a factor, indicative of a comprehensive understanding
- effectively employed historical evidence (often, this was beyond the obvious, reflecting insight)
- overtly made links beyond the immediately obvious, showing insight
- evaluated the effects and their significance
- wrote with clarity, cogency, and purpose.

### **Standard specific comments**

The selection of a relevant and conducive event has improved. There were fewer scripts related to unwieldy or unrelated events. The essay task was focused on short- and long-term impacts. Insightful responses often reflected the changing 'lens' or perspectives of society, commentators, and academics through time.

The trend continues for a reduced number of pre-prepared answers, and an increased number of concise scripts. Candidates and teachers appear to have grasped that Achievement with Excellence is attainable within the pages of the booklet.

## [History subject page](#)

### **Previous years' reports**

[2017 \(PDF, 49KB\)](#)    [2016 \(PDF, 222KB\)](#)

---

---

Copyright © New Zealand Qualifications Authority