

Subject: History

Level: 1

Standards: 91003, 91005, 91006

Part A: Commentary

A crucial aspect of the Level 1 History external assessments was candidates reading carefully and addressing the questions. Using key words from the questions in their responses enabled candidates to address the questions in a more concise manner.

The choice of historical event is key to achieving in the essay questions. Candidates who chose well-defined and specific events achieved higher grades than candidates who wrote on a broad event or movement. For example, focusing on the Gallipoli Campaign rather than World War I; or the Montgomery Bus Boycott rather than the Black Civil Rights movement, often achieved higher grades. Some historical event choices, such as natural and man-made disasters, limited candidates' ability to demonstrate comprehensive historical knowledge and skills.

Part B: Report on standards

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

Examination

This examination included three questions, each of which required candidates to use the resource material in their responses. The context for 2022 was the establishment and actions of the Māori Women's Welfare League, which related to the theme of individuals or groups who brought about social change in New Zealand. The questions required the candidates to use a range of historical skills to unpack the provided sources and answer the questions.

Observations

Candidates who used key words from the question in their opening sentence tended to answer the question in more depth than candidates who used headings or bullet points.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- used information directly from the source
- used clear topic sentences to help frame their response
- briefly answered the questions and used specific examples from sources.

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

- provided insufficient relevant evidence to address the questions
- wrote responses that were outside the scope of the questions
- copied out large extracts from the sources without linking to the questions.

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

- used an in-depth range of evidence to support their ideas
- used their own voice to discuss the sources relating to the questions
- attempted to interpret or explain each piece of evidence as opposed to listing paraphrased or quoted material
- developed at least one idea in depth for each question.

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

- used a clear paragraph structure that developed more than one idea comprehensively
- used multiple sources to support the development of their ideas
- integrated evidence into the discussion and included a strong candidate voice
- included a perceptive comment that showed understanding beyond the sources.

91005: Describe the causes and consequences of a historical event

Examination

This examination required the candidates to write on the consequences of their chosen historical event. The candidates were expected to write a brief description of their event, then identify and describe more than one consequence in a coherent essay answer.

Observations

Many candidates spent too long writing about the event; this needed to be a short paragraph to set the context for the rest of the essay.

The choice of topic is important. Topics that worked well included:

- the Russian Revolution
- Stalin's rise to power

- the invasion of Parihaka
- 9/11
- the invasion of Manchuria
- Hitler gaining power
- the formation of the Mau movement
- the dawn raids
- the formation of the Polynesian Panthers
- Bastion Point.

Topics such as these allowed for clearly identified consequences that could be developed with in depth or comprehensive detail. When writing about long-term consequences, there needed to be an attempt to show a link between the consequence and the chosen historical event.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- identified an appropriate event and did not spend more time describing the event than was necessary
- identified (usually with a topic sentence) and described, using paragraphs, two appropriate consequences of an event
- included limited detail specific to each consequence
- implied that something was a consequence rather than clearly linking it to the event
- used narrative and often wrote in general terms in parts of their response.

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

- discussed only one consequence, or chose consequences which were not clearly linked to the chosen event, e.g. stating the 2022 Ukraine/Russia war is a consequence of World War II without explanation
- did not clearly identify an event, or chose an inappropriate event that did not allow for full coverage of the answer
- wrote only a narrative account of the event, with no discussion of the consequences
- focused too much on the causes.

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

- chose a suitable event with appropriately chosen consequences that allowed for in-depth coverage
- explained the event briefly in a paragraph
- explicitly linked the consequences to the event

- used clear topic sentences and paragraph structure, utilising the language of the question, e.g. “One long-term consequence of ...”
- developed both consequence paragraphs well and included details, such as dates, place names, and names of main participants in the event, which was then used to discuss how the consequences affected people.

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

- outlined the event briefly and then discussed two consequences in comprehensive depth and detail, using plenty of specific historical evidence and explanation
- included details such as the names of people and places, dates, statistics, and often a relevant quote to illustrate a point
- displayed excellent paragraph structure, using topic sentences to clearly define the different parts of the essay, i.e. used the language of the question, “One long-term consequence of ...”
- wrote clearly and concisely
- linked the event to the consequences explicitly and confidently, often at the end of the paragraph
- worked chronologically – dealt with the short-term consequence and then the long-term consequence.

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

Examination

This examination included three questions and required candidates to choose an event of significance to Aotearoa New Zealand.

Observations

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

Topics that worked 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
- the Whina Cooper Land March

- the arrest of Rua Kenana.

Topics that did not work as well included:

- natural and Man-made Disasters
- World War I, World War II, or the Vietnam War
- events that are significant but not historical, e.g. the 2019 Christchurch mosque shootings
- world events such as Black Civil Rights with only tentative links to New Zealand.

Candidates who did well in Question Three often made strong links to current events to show it is still significant, e.g. linking the Dawn Raids to the 2021 apology or linking the 1918 Spanish Flu Pandemic to Aotearoa New Zealand's response to the COVID-19 Pandemic.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- described what happened in the lead up to their chosen historical event
- identified two different individuals and/or groups and could describe specific actions for at least one of the individuals or groups, although one action may have been outside the scope of the question
- attempted to describe how their event shaped Aotearoa New Zealand at the time or since, but the description may have been very general and not supported by evidence
- used some evidence to support their description but often the evidence was limited in scope or not always accurate
- chose a topic that limited the depth of their response.

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

- described what happened during the event rather than the lead up to the event
- identified and responded about only one individual or group
- attempted to describe how their chosen event shaped Aotearoa New Zealand, but this was often brief or inaccurate and not specific
- chose a topic that was not linked to Aotearoa New Zealand or the shaping of society.

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

- described the chosen historical event in depth and used evidence to support their description
- identified and described the actions of two different individuals or groups accurately
- used evidence that was specific to their topic and to their chosen individuals or groups

- described in depth how the event shaped Aotearoa New Zealand, either at the time or since
- supported their ideas with evidence.

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 the lead up to their chosen historical event and used specific, detailed, and well considered evidence to support their description
- wrote responses that focused on what the questions were asking of them
- identified and described in detail specific actions of their chosen individuals or groups
- wrote about actions and linked them specifically to their event
- described how the event shaped New Zealanders at the time, as well as how it continued 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.