

2023 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	History
Level:	Level 1
Achievement standard(s):	91003, 91005, 91006

General commentary

Candidates should read the questions carefully and ensure that their responses are addressing the question(s) asked. Candidates who used key words from the questions in their responses addressed the questions in a more concise and focused manner.

The choice of historical event was important in 91005 and 91006. Candidates who chose well-defined and specific events achieved higher grades than candidates who wrote on a broad event or movement, e.g. focusing on the Gallipoli Campaign rather than World War I, or the Montgomery Bus Boycott rather than the Black Civil Rights movement. Some historical event choices, such as natural and man-made disasters, limited candidates' ability to demonstrate comprehensive understanding.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

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

Assessment

The examination required candidates to answer three questions, using specific evidence from the resources provided about changes to people's shopping habits in twentieth-century Aotearoa New Zealand.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- selected accurate evidence to copy from the resources that related to the specific question
- used or cited only one source to draw the material on to support the answer to the question
- answered at least one question implicitly rather than explicitly
- used quotes from the resources to answer the questions, rather than paraphrasing or summarising information.

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

- used the sources to help support their ideas
- developed at least one idea in depth.

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

- described multiple ideas in their responses to the question that were relevant and linked to the question being asked
- integrated evidence into their response
- demonstrated a strong candidate voice in their response
- included a perceptive comment that showed understanding beyond the sources.

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

- copied quotes of the sources without attempting to link it to the question being asked
- attempted only some of the questions
- wrote responses that did not address the questions being asked.

Achievement standard 91005: Describe the causes and consequences of an historical event

Assessment

The examination required candidates to answer an essay question, discussing the main causes of a studied historical event.

Commentary

Candidates seemed well prepared for writing an essay focusing on the causes of their chosen historical event.

The choice of historical event was important. Events which worked well allowed for clear causes to be identified and developed with in-depth, comprehensive detail. Choosing a specific event, such as the Montgomery Bus Boycott, rather than the Black Civil Rights Movement; or a specific event in World War I or World War II, rather than writing on the whole event, tended to provide the focus and detail required to achieve higher grades.

Topics that worked well included:

- the Russian Revolution
- Stalin's rise to power
- the invasion of Parihaka
- the invasion of Manchuria
- Hitler gaining power
- formation of the Mau movement
- the dawn raids
- formation of the Polynesian Panthers
- Bastion Point.

Although writing a brief description of the event is good practice, the main focus of the essay needed to be the specific causes that led to the event rather than a narrative of the event.

To gain a grade of Merit or higher, candidates were expected to link the causes to the chosen historical event. This was generally done at the end of each paragraph in two or three sentences.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- identified and wrote about two causes in a basic, structured essay with an introduction and conclusion, without explicitly defining one or both of these causes
- used a clear topic sentence to introduce each cause
- chose events which did not allow historical causes and consequences to be drilled down into, such as natural or human disasters
- gave a response that had breadth but not depth, e.g. lots of short paragraphs with different ideas
- gave broad generalisations with limited evidence
- stated that there was a causal link but did not describe or explain this link.

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

- chose a suitable event with causes which allowed for in-depth coverage
- wrote clear topic sentences with good structure overall
- began paragraphs with a topic sentence that used the language of the question, e.g. "one short-term cause of ..."
- wrote well-developed paragraphs about causes, although these were sometimes imbalanced in terms of depth
- linked the causes to the event clearly, giving a valid reason (rather than just stating it was a cause)
- described their causes in detail
- presented their essay in chronological order, often identifying the long-term cause first while following it up with a short-term, 'trigger' cause.

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

- chose an event with appropriately chosen causes allowing for comprehensive coverage
- linked each cause explicitly to the event with depth and detail
- explained clearly and explicitly why each cause was important
- used plenty of specific historical detail and supporting evidence such as statistics, names, places, dates, and quotes (sometimes from historians) to make their points
- explained the importance of the historical details to show a thorough understanding of the event and its causes
- wrote in a clear, concise, and well-structured manner, allowing for clear communication of their ideas.

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

- based their response on an event but not a clearly-defined or a specific time-bound event
 - chose causes that were not relevant to the event, or were inappropriate, or poorly described
 - described consequences rather than causes
 - described only one cause, when two were asked for
 - wrote a narrative of what happened but nothing, or little, about why it happened
 - placed undue emphasis on, or used a lot of, emotive language or opinions.
-

Achievement standard 91006: Describe how a significant historical event affected New Zealand society

Assessment

The examination required candidates to answer three questions, using a significant historical event that has affected New Zealand society.

Commentary

Candidates who focused on specific events, rather than large events or movements tended to be able to write a more conscious and detailed response.

Topics that work well included:

- the invasion of Parihaka
- the Springbok tour
- the Rainbow Warrior bombing
- Gallipoli
- the discovery of New Zealand by Captain Cook
- the 1918 flu pandemic
- the Bastion Point protest
- Whina Cooper's land march
- the arrest of Rua Kenana.

Topics that did not work as well:

- natural or man-made disasters
- World War I, II, or the Vietnam War
- events that were significant but not historical, e.g. the 2019 Christchurch mosque shooting
- world events such as Black Civil Rights, where even tentative links were unable to be made to New Zealand in Question Three.

Candidates who did well in Question Three often made strong links to current events to show how the past event is still significant, e.g. linking the dawn raids to the more recent apology; or linking the 1918 Spanish Flu pandemic to New Zealand's response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- described what happened during their chosen event
- identified two different groups or individuals involved in their chosen event and described an action that they took before or during the event
- described how their event shaped the lives of New Zealand at the time or since, but not necessarily in detail
- used some evidence to support their description but often the evidence was limited in scope
- chose a topic that limited the depth of answer, e.g. a natural disaster.

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

- described what happened during their chosen historical event in depth
- identified two different individuals or groups accurately, describing an action that they took and why they took the action
- explained why the event was significant at the time and how it continues to be significant today
- used relevant and accurate evidence throughout their responses to support their descriptions and explanations.

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

- chose a clearly-defined event that could be used to answer all three questions in depth or comprehensively
- described what happened during their chosen historical event and used specific, detailed, and well-considered evidence to support their description, focusing on what the question was asking
- identified and described in detail specific actions of their chosen individuals or groups and accurately explained why they took the specific action(s) that they took
- described how the event shaped New Zealanders at the time, as well as how it continues to shape the lives of New Zealanders
- used well-considered evidence to support their description and made strong links to other historically significant events or presently significant events
- wrote succinctly and focused on answering the questions, using well-considered and accurate evidence.

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

- attempted only one or two of the questions
- described what happened during the lead up to their event, rather than what happened during the event
- identified only one group or individual, or did not correctly describe actions linking to the chosen event
- attempted to describe how their chosen event shaped New Zealand, but this was often brief or contained inaccurate generalisations
- chose a topic that was not linked to New Zealand or shaping New Zealand society.