Assessment Report
Level 1 History 2016

Standards 91003 91005 91006

Part A: Commentary
The candidates who were well prepared and applied their knowledge of historical thinking performed well in the examinations.

For Achievement Standards 91005 and 91006, candidates who applied a well-chosen historical event that was suitable to the standard and then successfully applied their knowledge to the questions being asked of them achieved well.

Some candidates chose topics for Achievement Standard 91005 that had limited causes and/or consequences.

Those candidates who chose a natural disaster for either or both papers often lacked the breadth or depth required to achieve Merit or Excellence.

Candidates are encouraged to choose a specific event rather than focusing on a movement or large scale event like World War One or World War Two.

Part B: Report on Standards

91003: Interpret sources of an historical event of significance to New Zealanders
Candidates who were awarded Achievement commonly:

- addressed some questions or parts of questions in a basic way
- identified the relevant key ideas and supported these with sufficient evidence
- did not fully explain their answers
- used minimal evidence from the resource booklet
- had difficulty answering in their own words – rather, candidates used quotes without further explanation
- engaged briefly with the resources to provide a simple answer to the question
- wrote narrative responses
- quoted directly from the source without putting their answer in their own words.

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

- wrote brief responses that did not show understanding of what the question was asking of them
- directly copied source material without adding to the response or selecting parts of the source that accurately addressed the question
- included irrelevant material
- did not provide evidence from resources
- failed to answer all questions in the booklet.

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

- wrote fluently and confidently in their own words, accurately interpreting key ideas for each question and supporting their ideas with relevant and in depth evidence
- went beyond the immediately obvious in their answers, showing a more developed response to the question and often utilising information from a range of sources
- wrote in-depth responses
- demonstrated a clear understanding of the question being asked
- demonstrated an understanding of a range of historical concepts
- made connections between different sources.

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

- wrote a logical and structured response that was concise, with little irrelevant material. Often their answers demonstrated insightful understanding of both the resources and questions
- used evidence effectively to comprehensively answer the question
- developed their own conclusions by perceptively linking sources
- showed a comprehensive understanding of the question
- selected relevant quotes from sources and demonstrated an understanding of intent and consequence
- consistently demonstrated an understanding of the whole question being asked
- demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of a range of historical concepts.

**Standard-specific comments**

Candidates are advised to focus on the wording of all three questions, specifically instructions that direct them to answer in their own words and then to use evidence from the sources to support their own historical thinking.
91005: Describe the causes and consequences of an historical event

Candidates who were awarded Achievement commonly:

- described at least one cause and one consequence of a suitably chosen event. Candidates who described at least two causes and consequences could gain an A4 grade
- chose a difficult event that tended to have only one cause or consequence
- described several good causes and only one consequence, or vice versa
- used some supporting evidence in their explanation but lacked detail and evidence
- had a structured response, often not following a chronological sequence
- gave a detailed account of the event itself (“telling the story”), rather than exploring the causes and consequences
- attempted to link their ideas to the event with one or two sentences at the end of the paragraph

Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:

- mentioned causes and consequences but made little attempt to describe them
- did not answer both parts of the question – described either a cause or a consequence
- wrote a narrative of the event itself without making connections to either causes or consequences
- lacked structure, making the response difficult to follow
- chose an event that was difficult to frame as having historical causes and consequences; for example, the Erebus disaster, Tangiwai disaster, or Napier earthquake.

Candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit commonly:

- described the causes and consequences in detail
- supported their response with evidence (e.g. dates, names of people groups, places involved or a short quotation)
- explained the links
- wrote structured essays that utilised a chronological sequence
- gave causes and consequences that were clearly linked to the topic
- carefully chose events that had historical depth.

Candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence commonly:

- comprehensively described three to four causes and consequences
- supported ideas with accurate and relevant supporting evidence
- clearly developed the link between the event, the causes and the consequences
- wrote well-structured essays that utilised a chronological sequence, which were well balanced and fully developed with correct, relevant, and specific supporting detail.

Standard-specific comments
The choice of event by candidates remains an area of concern. Candidates who chose an event with only one cause or one consequence were severely disadvantaged. Natural disaster often disadvantaged the candidate as there were limited comprehensive causes and/or consequences. Candidates who chose events with historical depth such as the Birmingham Campaign, had the opportunity to write in more depth than an event such as The Little Rock Nine.

Candidates who choose to write on a movement rather a specific event were similarly disadvantaged. A common example of this is “The Black Civil Rights Movement” or “The Feminist Movement”. Candidates did not achieve highly when trying to write about these. World War One and World War Two were also problematic for candidates. These topics often lacked cohesion as well as effective links between causes and event and were often very narrative.

Candidates need to link their causes and consequences to the event. For example, some candidates described the contents of the Treaty of Versailles in great detail, but did not explain how this led to the rise of Hitler. Others discussed slavery, the Civil War and the Emancipation Proclamation in great detail, but did not clearly link it to the onset of segregation and their chosen Civil Rights event.

Candidates are advised to read the question carefully and understand that the standard requires a discussion of causes and consequences, as well as clearly linking the causes to their event. They should avoid spending a lot of time writing about the event at the expense of describing the causes and consequences.

91006: Describe how a significant historical event affected New Zealanders

Candidates who were awarded Achievement commonly:

- gave rote responses that demonstrated generalisations for most questions
- used some specific historical information to support their responses
- provided an adequate description of an historical event that covered the event
- described valid actions and reactions, but may have chosen an action that happened before or after the event, or chose a reaction that happened before their chosen action
- provided a basic explanation as to why the event was significant to New Zealanders, usually framed as basic consequences
- gave some limited insight into how the event affected New Zealanders
- explained some of the impacts of the event on New Zealand society.

Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:

- provided answers that were limited, or misunderstood what the question was asking of them
- partly answered some of the questions
- provided little or no supporting evidence
- provided a description of an historical event that was not significant to NZ
• provided a basic and/or limited description of an historical event that included significant factual errors
• were unable to identify specific groups or people involved during their event and their actions/reactions
• did not accurately describe a relevant action or reaction related to their chosen historical event
• provided anecdotal evidence only or made sweeping unsupported generalisations
• provided a limited explanation of how the historical event was of significance to New Zealanders
• did not explain the extent to which the event impacted the lives of New Zealanders or how the event impacted on New Zealand society
• were unable to demonstrate an accurate understanding of the historical event.

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

• wrote with conviction and structured their answer demonstrating detail, and specifically addressed the question
• used a range of supporting evidence
• provided a detailed description of their chosen historic event and provided relevant and accurate supporting evidence
• described in detail the actions/reactions related to their historical event
• made valid links between actions and reactions
• provided an explicit and detailed explanation as to why the event was significant to New Zealand and how the event affected individuals and New Zealand society overall
• demonstrated an in-depth understanding of the historical event, including its impact upon individuals and groups within New Zealand society.

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

• answered all three questions lucidly
• wrote a coherent and well-written answer that addressed the questions and made effective use of detailed evidence
• used a range of valid and relevant evidence to support their written response
• provided a comprehensive description of the historic event with accurate and relevant supporting evidence, including specific contexts, events and personalities
• produced a comprehensive description of an action and reaction and related it specifically to the historic event
• used detailed examples of specific actions, reactions and reasons for the reaction taken by a person/people/groups
• made valid and specific links between individuals and/or groups relating to the action of ‘person one’ and the reaction of ‘person two’
• showed in-depth and comprehensive understanding of the concept of significance and applied this to their event
• produced a comprehensive and valid description, identifying explicitly why the event was of significance to New Zealand
• demonstrated a developed understanding of the impact of the event on New Zealand society
• provided specific evidence (in Question 3) and linked this clearly to their event.
Standard-specific comments

Candidates must be able to demonstrate an understanding of the concept of significance and how to determine and establish this within their chosen context. There is also the need to ensure that the chosen topic is placed within a wider context to allow candidates to demonstrate the concept of significance beyond vague generalities.
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