

Assessment Report

On this page

[Level 1 History 2020](#) ▾

Level 1 History 2020

Standards [91003](#) [91005](#) [91006](#)

Part A: Commentary

Candidates who chose well-defined, specific historical events tended to achieve well. Having an understanding of key historical concepts also benefited the candidates.

The choice of historical event is key to achieving 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 choosing a specific campaign within the Black Civil Rights movement, e.g. the Montgomery Bus Boycott.

Some historical event choices, such as natural and man-made disasters, limited candidates from demonstrating comprehensiveness.

Historical events that worked well included:

- Specific campaigns of the Black Civil Rights movement, e.g. the Montgomery Bus Boycott or the Birmingham Campaign

- Specific actions or campaigns in WWI, e.g. Gallipoli
- Hitler's rise to power
- Japanese invasion of Manchuria
- Atomic bombing of Hiroshima
- Yom Kippur War
- Formation of Israel
- Reign of Terror in France
- Execution of King Charles
- Mau movement in Samoa
- Dawn Raids
- Invasion of Parihaka
- Springbok tour
- Rainbow Warrior bombing
- Bastion Point protest
- Arrest of Rua Kenana
- Discovery of New Zealand by Captain Cook
- 1918 flu pandemic
- Whina Cooper's land march.

Part B: Report on standards

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

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- answered only one part of the question
- identified a couple of changes to New Zealand society in Question Two

- used generic ideas about reliability of the source rather than specifically discussing the play
- used quotes as part of their answer without explaining how they linked to the response
- used only one or two sources to support their ideas.

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

- attempted only one or two of the questions
- provided a brief statement without using evidence to support their ideas
- quoted the sources without using their own words to answer the question
- misread what the question was asking of them.

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

- integrated the evidence from multiple sources into their ideas, which were explained in depth, rather than just stated
- linked related ideas into one large paragraph rather than breaking them into smaller concepts.

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

- used wide-ranging evidence pulled from different sources and constructed into an answer
- included an explanation or link to the question, rather than just presenting information
- fully addressed the question, responding to both options of reliability/usefulness in Question Three
- looked for connections beyond the obvious
- wrote perceptive comments that either identified the unintended consequences of actions or else suggested hidden motivations, e.g. the possible motive of a theatre company/director to manipulate the audience towards a biased perspective.

Standard specific comments

Candidates are advised to read all three questions in the paper carefully, plan the material to be used for each response, and use their own words as well as the sources to support their answers (as opposed to copying large chunks of text from the sources).

Candidates would benefit by making connections to wider events/ideas/knowledge to show perceptive understanding within an answer built on a foundation of detailed evidence – at times responses drifted into deep reflection of the topic but became more general with limited evidence.

91005: Describe the causes and consequences of an historical event

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- answered both parts of the question, describing at least one cause and one impact in a paragraphed essay
- provided little or no detail/used limited evidence to back up the main points
- implied the links between the causes and impacts to the event, rather than clearly describing these
- wrote a lot about the event rather than the causes and impacts.

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

- answered only one part of the question, e.g. gave only a cause or an impact, but not both
- relied on narrative – telling the story of what happened before, during, and/or after the event, without discussing any of the causes or impacts
- muddled the causes and impacts, often with intrusive errors.

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

- chose a clearly-defined event that allowed for detailed coverage of both causes and impacts
- described two causes and impacts that were directly connected to the event in detail, using accurate explanation, supporting evidence, and examples

- used historical detail to back up their points, e.g. specific dates, names of people and places, statistics, and sometimes short quotes
- structured their essay well, clearly linking the causes and impacts to the event
- used the language of the question in a topic sentence to clearly signal the main point of the paragraph
- included a brief, clear description of the event.

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

- described two causes and impacts in a comprehensive way, using a range of examples and evidence such as dates, names, statistics, and/or short quotes from historians and/or participants
- linked the causes and impacts to a well-chosen event explicitly and succinctly
- structured their paragraphs thoughtfully to group related information into fewer, more developed paragraphs, rather than multiple smaller paragraphs.

Standard specific comments

Candidates are advised to answer both parts of the question. Candidates who focused on writing two causes and impacts in detail rather than writing about more with less detail achieved higher grades.

Some candidates confused specific causes and impacts with events that occurred before and after the main event. Candidates would benefit by clearly linking each cause and impact to the chosen event, i.e. explaining why it is a cause or how it is a cause of this particular event, rather than just saying it was a cause.

Well-structured essays with a clear topic sentence at the beginning of each paragraph and a linking statement (usually at the end of each paragraph) tended to achieve higher grades.

91006: Describe how a significant historical event affected New Zealanders

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- described what happened during their chosen historical event (rather than the lead up)
- identified two different individuals or groups associated with their event and described either their perspective or an action they took
- attempted to describe how their event shaped the lives of New Zealanders at the time or since, however the description was often general and not supported by evidence
- attempted to use evidence, but this was often limited in scope or inaccurate.

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

- attempted only one or two of the questions
- described the lead up to the event rather than the event itself
- identified and responded about one individual or group
- chose a topic that was not significant to New Zealand or did not say how it shaped New Zealand society.

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

- described what happened during their chosen historical event in depth
- identified two different individual or groups associated with their chosen event accurately and then described both their perspectives and actions accurately
- described how the event shaped New Zealand society either at the time or how it continues to shape New Zealand society
- effectively used relevant and accurate evidence to support their responses.

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, focusing on what the question was asking of them, and remaining closely within the time frames of their chosen topic
- identified and described the perspectives and actions of specific individuals or groups, with the actions chosen specifically supporting their perspectives and linking directly to the event

- used well-considered evidence to support their responses consistently
- made strong links to other significant historical events or current significant events
- wrote succinct and focused responses that directly addressed the question.

Standard specific comments

Candidates who focused on specific events rather than large events or movements tended to write more concise and detailed responses.

Candidates who gained higher grades in Question Three often made strong links to current or recent events to demonstrate the significance of the event.

[History subject page](#)

Previous years' reports

[2019 \(PDF, 249KB\)](#) [2018 \(PDF, 119KB\)](#) [2017 \(PDF, 49KB\)](#) [2016 \(PDF, 224KB\)](#)