

## 2023 NCEA Assessment Report

<b>Subject:</b>	History
<b>Level:</b>	Level 3
<b>Achievement standard(s):</b>	91436, 91438, 91439

### General commentary

Candidates who clearly and explicitly reflected the terminology of the questions in their responses experienced success. This type of response also tended to demonstrate a high level of preparation and/or planning, rather than rehearsed or rote-learned responses.

Topic selection remains very important for the essay standards and is discussed in more detail in the standard-specific reports.

### Report on individual achievement standard(s)

#### **Achievement standard 91436: Analyse evidence relating to an historical event of significance to New Zealanders**

##### Assessment

The examination required candidates to answer three questions, using evidence from the resources provided about the role of women in the New Zealand Police Force.

There were three historical relationships that were assessed using this context: cause and effect (although only causes were asked for), continuity and change, and past and present.

##### Commentary

Candidates engaged enthusiastically with the topic material about policewomen in New Zealand.

Those candidates who had prepared to discuss social change in New Zealand were able to place the topic in the wider context of the roles of women changing in society.

Candidates who engaged with the sources, planned and then made generalisations that addressed the questions, and used appropriate evidence to support those generalisations tended to do well. Those candidates who engaged with the sources in purely a sequential manner, found it difficult to construct an in-depth response.

Kaiako should take care to ensure that ākonga have a full understanding of all of the relevant concepts as distinct and contrasting within the historical relationship, rather than just the relationship of, e.g. “continuity and change” as a singular concept.

While an understanding of “reliability and usefulness” is important in the analysis of evidence, writing extensively about this historical concept from the sources was not required for any of the questions, and candidates should ensure that they address the question(s).

## Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- answered only one part of the question, e.g. continuity or change
- referred to sources individually, rather than identifying where sources supported each other
- provided limited evidence from the sources to support their answers
- engaged with the sources sequentially, rather than synthesising generalisations from all relevant sources
- addressed the relevant concepts in an implicit manner, rather than explicitly explaining a response to the question
- provided lengthy rewording of source material to support their ideas, rather than selecting the most relevant evidence.

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

- understood the historical concepts and were able to accurately apply them to the sources
- addressed both ‘parts’ of a historical relationship, e.g. continuity and change
- interpreted the sources accurately, in both their content and context
- provided several generalisations that addressed the question and supported those ideas with relevant evidence
- wrote responses that were more than just narrative or a sequential description of the sources.

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

- used a wide range of the most relevant evidence from the sources
- began each response with a clear argument that was maintained and supported throughout
- used categorisation and / or prioritisation to explore key ideas and assess their importance
- demonstrated a high level of engagement and understanding of the source material
- referred to sources other than those specified, where relevant
- demonstrated a clear understanding of factors that help or hinder social change and could apply these to the context of the paper.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- misinterpreted the source material
- did not understand the historical concepts being assessed
- rewrote the source material, rather than answering the question
- did not provide evidence from the sources in their responses.

## Achievement standard 91438: Analyse the causes and consequences of a significant historical event

### Assessment

The examination required candidates to answer an essay question, evaluating a long-term and a short-term cause of a significant historical event, and showing an understanding of which was the more important cause and why.

### Commentary

Due to the structure of the question (a short-term cause and a long-term cause), candidates generally stuck to providing two causes of their event, which allowed for greater depth in their discussions and aided in conciseness. The second part of the question helped candidates to address prioritisation. This appeared to prompt many candidates to think and write in a more evaluative way.

Candidates who chose specific and historically significant events for their essays did well. Those candidates who overtly and explicitly addressed the importance or significance of their chosen event and its causes also did well.

### Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- showed understanding of their chosen event and the selected causes (one short term and one long term), although some causes selected were questionable in terms of importance or relevance to the event
- included some relevant evidence to support the discussion
- identified the most important cause and attempted to explain why it was the most important cause
- attempted to provide an explanation as to the relationship between each cause and the event, although sometimes this was limited.

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

- planned a response carefully tailored to the examination prompt
- selected a significant historical event that was suitable for NCEA Level 3 and gave some detail about the event
- wrote about events that had sufficient evidence to allow for depth in explanation
- chose two causes, one long term and one short term, that were relevant to their historical event and attempted to explain the relationship between each cause and the event
- provided evidence that was mostly relevant and explained it well
- provided information that was largely error free, showing very strong content knowledge
- acknowledged the relative importance of each cause and overtly prioritised these causes (whether in a conclusion or a separate paragraph, or within their main causes paragraphs), making it clear which cause was the most important and why, relative to each other.

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

- chose historical events that allowed for insight and understanding at NCEA Level 3
- planned a response carefully to ensure that they made well-considered choices of an important long-term and an important short-term cause of the event
- established their argument in the introduction of their essay, and sustained and developed the argument throughout, as each cause was introduced and analysed in relation to the event
- explained the event clearly and its scope or parameters, and showed that they knew the event well throughout the argument
- showed insight into the complexity of their chosen causes, addressing such things as context, conditions, contingency, and relevant mātauranga Māori concepts where appropriate, and wove this understanding throughout the argument
- provided comprehensive analysis through the selection of well-chosen, accurate, and relevant evidence, examples, and quotes that supported the argument
- wrote a separate, well-constructed paragraph that evaluated the more important cause relative to the other causes, with detailed justification for that decision, showing understanding of the complexity of causation (the more perceptive arguments went beyond “if x hadn’t happened, y could never have occurred”)
- made judicious use of historiography (when choosing to use it), to enhance their own argument around importance, rather than using it in such a way that detracted from a clear answer to the question
- wrote as concisely as they could under examination conditions and given the question posed, their event chosen, the complexity of causation, and the requirement to evaluate importance of causation.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- did not address all parts of the prompt – in particular, the part asking for the most important cause
- struggled to identify a relevant long-term and short-term cause
- explained only one cause, or did not establish causation between the cause and the event
- did not write with enough explanation, underestimating the depth of explanation and analysis expected at Level 8 of the curriculum
- showed surface level understanding of the event and its causes and included significant errors of key factual material.

---

## **Achievement standard 91439: Analyse a significant historical trend and the force(s) that influenced it**

### **Assessment**

The examination required candidates to answer an essay question, evaluating to what extent a significant historical trend was influenced by two significant forces.

## Commentary

Candidates who chose appropriate topics and had a strong knowledge of their historical trend material did well, and were able to accurately identify relevant and appropriate forces and trends, writing balanced responses that examined both forces.

## Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- wrote about two forces
- used some rote-learned content that did not always directly relate to the question
- examined the trend and the forces that influenced it in a chronological narrative.

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

- assessed the differing influences of the two forces on the trend
- were explicit and clear in their writing
- made explicit links between the forces and the trend
- included some relevant historiography in support of their argument
- included well-chosen evidence to support their argument
- used a structured essay format to make and sustain an argument.

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

- made a judgement as to which of the forces was more influential
- acknowledged the complexity of the interconnectedness between forces and trends
- used carefully selected relevant historiography and evidence to support and maintain an argument
- understood that historical narratives can and do change over time
- chose a topic that was appropriate for NCEA Level 3 and Curriculum Level 8.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- wrote about only one force
- did not show the depth of knowledge or understanding required for NCEA Level 3
- provided little or no evidence in support of their statements
- chose inappropriate contexts to write about, often focusing on individuals or events, which are not historical trends
- repeated rote-learned material without attempting to respond to any part of the essay prompt.