

National Certificate of Educational Achievement

2013 Assessment Report

History Level 1

- 91003 Interpret sources of an historical event of significance to New Zealanders**
- 91005 Describe the causes and consequences of an historical event**
- 91006 Describe how a significant historical event affected New Zealand society**

COMMENTARY

Many candidates were well prepared for the standards, and could write in breadth and depth on their chosen topics. Many of the scripts demonstrated that candidates were thoroughly prepared for the examination, and had specific and accurate historical evidence to support their ideas. Candidates need to be cautious of prepared responses that do not address the examination question.

Grade Score Marking (GSM) was used for all three papers. AS91003 and AS91006 were marked as three separate questions.

There is a trend of broadening topics that are both relevant and engaging to Level 1 candidates. There are also some topics that were more problematic for 91005 and 91006. Candidates need to make sure that their topic choice is not too broad or too narrow.

STANDARD REPORTS

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

QUESTION ONE

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:

- identified what carless days were and why they were introduced
- extracted relevant information in a jumbled order, but covered the what and the why sufficiently
- demonstrated an understanding of the what and why but with very little explanation of their own
- covered what in their own words briefly, and why was extracted from the sources, or vice versa
- supported explanation with some evidence, however this could have been irrelevant
- answered either the what or why in some depth but just touched on the other half of the question.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:

- wrote very little or made a brief statement only
- misunderstood and/or failed to answer the question fully – only answered the what or the why
- used only information from the introduction
- extracted material word for word from the sources, but had no explanation or commentary to support this
- extracted material that was either haphazard or irrelevant.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- carefully selected relevant evidence from the sources and avoided extra information that did not directly address the question
- included some irrelevant material but this did not detract from their overall answer
- interpreted both parts of the question in depth, by providing their own explanation of what were carless days and why they were introduced and often linking them
- identified the source of their information or paraphrased information from several sources into their own words.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- covered both parts of the question in depth, interpreting comprehensively what carless days were and why they were introduced
- provided comprehensive evidence from a number of sources with little or no irrelevant evidence included
- Identified the source of their information
- showed perception with a sophisticated explanation, in their own words, with a solid understanding of the sources clearly obvious in the argument they pulled together
- used sources as a way of strengthening the argument, rather than starting with the sources as a means to answer the question
- wrote analytically, with evidence of weighing up the different pieces of evidence to support a full answer.

QUESTION TWO

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:

- described TWO ways in which New Zealanders responded to carless days with some evidence, often quoted directly from source rather than in candidates own words
- used limited supporting evidence
- provided limited explanation of evidence and included some irrelevant material
- extracted ideas but showed no depth of understanding of sources
- answered one soundly with a quote and a brief explanation, but the other one answered barely sufficiently
- used relevant quotes that covered two responses, but often misinterpreted what this quote meant when attempting to explain it in their own words.
- attempted both parts of the question but more quotes than explanation limiting the depth of their answers.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:

- provided only one response and wrote very brief answers
- directly copied large parts of the sources
- provided general responses with no evidence
- provided minimal descriptions of their identified response
- extracted material and did not apply it to the question.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- demonstrated a clear understanding of what was meant by a response and covered two responses in some depth
- explained in their own words what the evidence showed
- carefully selected evidence to reinforce their explanations from several identified sources
- provided a well-supported answer to two responses
- demonstrated the ability categorize their responses , eg positive/negative or sneaky/accepting, then support ideas with evidence, some may have been irrelevant.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- directly addressed the question covering both responses comprehensively and perceptively
- carefully selected a range of evidence to reinforce well considered generalisations
- provided little or no irrelevant material
- comprehensively explained evidence provided
- used several identified sources to back up responses
- showed a perceptive understanding of the sources involved by their choice of an overarching generalisation: such as conformity to the system, and those that deliberately cheated a system they had no respect or time for.
- Supported up general response idea with carefully chosen excerpts from the relevant sources, which tied in to create a clear, coherent answer.
- demonstrated empathy for the stances of different groups in the community and their socio economic ranking as displayed in the manner in which they handled the material.

QUESTION THREE

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:

- identified both official and personal views of carless days as shown in the sources indicated
- selected some relevant supporting evidence

- attempted a response to the question by discussing successes, problems of source I and attempted a comparison, though weak/incorrect with Source G
- avoided successes, problems outlined in Source G, but directly gave at least one accurate comparison
- identified from Source I some successes and problems in detail but missed the comparison completely
- provided a valid comparison but with little evidence extracted from either source
- provided an answer using evidence from one source more than the other
- provided a general comparison that saw the two sources as being similar rather than different as the question implied but failed to develop the argument.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:

- misinterpreted the question entirely or misunderstood the points of view
- used random and irrelevant quotes
- were unable to clearly identify official and personal views of carless days
- considered the nature of the evidence rather than views
- wrote brief answers, which failed to cover the requirements of the question.
- copied whole paragraphs straight from the sources with no explanation or understanding of these being evident
- attempted to complete a usefulness/reliability question, rather than completing what the question asked of them.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- clearly and accurately identified official and personal views of carless days, understood the question and attempted all three parts
- selected relevant evidence from the sources to reinforce their explanations and provided some explanations in their own depth
- concentrated mostly on the comparison of Source I to G, though tended to provide too much from G or I rather than equally
- made an accurate comparison using their own words and extracted the deeper meaning behind Source I
- wrote clearly, coherently and concisely, directly answering the set question in their own words
- interpreted material from the government sources sufficiently to make more than one good comparison with the personal views of carless days
- selected relevant information when they were quoting, able to back up their line of argument on the official view of success, or a comparison with the personal views
- showed critical thinking above the sources to come up with very good comparisons and a few similarities between the sources, but may have also included some irrelevant material.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- demonstrated superior historical thinking skills in their identification of perspective, consequence and agency (even if they may not have recognized the concepts) and worked as historians, applying levels of critical thinking and analysis that were genuinely impressive
- carefully selected a range of relevant evidence to show an understanding of official and personal views of carless days
- provided clear, literate, balanced and perceptive explanations which directly addressed the question
- concentrated mostly on the comparison of Source I to G with evidence equally provided from both sources
- made accurate comparisons using their own words and extracting the deeper meaning behind Source I
- understood the reasons for the government writing source I in the tone that it was in
- avoided quoting large chunks from each source
- showed mature handling of the sources, e.g. incorporated small, relevant snippets to back up arguments, keeping their answer from becoming unwieldy
- critically responded to the question and showed a thorough understanding of both sources and the perspective of the authors involved in both.

OTHER COMMENTS

Candidates need to be aware that a range of skills could be examined in this paper. It is important that teachers read the Achievement Standard carefully and are aware that any of the skills referred to under explanatory note 4 could be covered in the examination. There were a number of very good candidates who did not achieve to their potential as it appeared that they had been prepped to answer Question Three only as a reliability and usefulness question. Other skills that could be touched upon include – the interpretation of an historical idea or ideas, facts, perspectives, reliability, bias and limitations of the evidence etc.

91005 Describe the causes and consequences of an historical event

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:

- described at least one relevant cause and one relevant consequence. Evidence may have been lacking or inconsistent
- used the word “cause” and “consequence” in a topic sentence to begin each paragraph
- used a lot of narrative, often spending a lot of time describing the event rather than the causes and consequences
- gave some explanation, but lacked detail or evidence
- wrote an unbalanced essay where either the causes or consequences were numerous and described in detail in one half, but only included one relevant cause or consequence in the other half
- chose an event that did not lend itself to be able to be written about in detail. Events such as the Napier earthquake or Wahine disaster were problematic, mainly around the causes of the event, or they did not clearly define their event e.g. specifying their

event was the 1981 Springbok Tour, when a more appropriate definition might have been the controversy/protests over the Springbok Tour.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:

- did not give a reasonable description of at least one cause and one consequence or did not select causes and consequences that were directly relevant to the event, e.g. using slavery as the direct cause of the Montgomery bus protest, or apartheid as the cause of the 1981 Springbok Tour
- made a poor choice of event e.g. wrote on a broad topic such as the Black civil rights movement, giving every single event that took place, but not identifying any link or direct cause that sparked the movement
- wrote a largely narrative response and did not focus on specific causes or consequences

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- selected an event that met the requirements of the essay question, and the chosen event had causes and consequences
- wrote in well formed paragraphs that included topic sentences, explanations and supporting evidence
- attempted to explain and use the evidence by linking it to the point of their paragraph
- wrote with a consistent focus on the question and included a positive amount of factual detail e.g. specific statistics and names of places and people, quotations that were merged and melded into the essay
- wrote about the event in depth, sometimes not treating the causes and consequences evenly, but certainly with the necessary knowledge bank of ideas required for a more developed answer.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- selected an appropriate event that allowed them to explain the causes and consequences in comprehensive detail
- selected topics that constituted 'flash points' where a range of causes influenced a single event and a range of consequences flowed from it
- wrote proficiently and logically, giving well-structured articulate answers
- kept a consistent focus on the question, avoiding narrative or story telling
- supported points with a comprehensive amount of precise detail such as names of people and places as well as statistics and clear on chronological order
- made specific reference to the cause or consequence at the beginning and end of each paragraph.

OTHER COMMENTS

The majority of candidates are introducing causes and consequences and many are classifying these into short term, long term, social, political etc. Each year the variety of topics is broadening and it is encouraging to see many relevant and engaging contexts. These clearly structured essays, which dealt specifically with causes and consequences in a logical manner, stood out.

One issue is candidates using what appears to be rote learned answers that do not relate to the question asked.

It should be noted that some events are still problematic in terms of cause and/or consequence:

1. The Springbok Tour – This event needs to be clearly defined by the student – whether it is the controversy/protests, or the Tour itself. If candidates chose the Tour, then apartheid was not accepted as a clear cause.
2. Black Civil Rights – some events within the movement are more difficult to establish causation and/or relevant consequences. It is not acceptable for candidates to simply list events/aspects that came before, or after, an event. Candidates need to be careful in their choice of event. They need to be able to identify specific causes and consequences of that particular event, and not write copious paragraphs on such things as slavery, the US civil war and the election of Barack Obama as being causes and consequences of the Montgomery bus protest, the Birmingham Campaign, Little Rock or other events that happened within the topic.
3. New Zealand disasters – it is difficult to establish causation with relevant historical supporting evidence for events such as the Wahine and the Napier earthquake. Candidates choosing these topics struggled to gain good grades. Consequences were easier to construct.

91006 Describe how a significant historical event affected New Zealand society

QUESTION ONE

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:

- identified an historical event
- described some of the key details about an event
- described some factual information about the event, but some of this may have been irrelevant or incorrect
- provided more detail about the context, causes or consequences of the event, rather than focusing on describing the event itself.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:

- chose an event which had no connection to New Zealand
- described an event which had a connection to New Zealand, but did not make clear what the connection was to New Zealand or New Zealanders
- described only a small part of an event
- supported events with inaccurate, incorrect or irrelevant evidence.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- described most aspects of the event in detail
- included relevant and historically correct factual information with few errors
- included important background contextual information.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- comprehensively described the event, provided a concise, well-structured, rounded, full explanation
- referred to a range of aspects of the event
- wrote with structure and good use of paragraphs.

QUESTION TWO

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:

- identified /described perspectives from two different groups/people although these may have been brief
- described a very large group such as New Zealanders
- supported ideas with some evidence, although this may have been irrelevant or inaccurate.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:

- wrote about effects upon individuals/groups, actions of individuals/groups or events, rather than perspectives
- failed to link their answer to the specific event even when they wrote the event on the planning page
- wrote only one perspective.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- identified two clear perspectives
- provided detailed descriptions of the perspectives of the individual/group
- chose a clearly defined group such as NZ Police or NZ government, or individuals such as Robert Muldoon
- provided more than one opinion, feeling or viewpoint, showing an understanding of complexities and nuance
- provided one perspective that was weaker than the other.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- described comprehensively two perspectives linked to their chosen event, with very little or no irrelevant or incorrect evidence
- chose a very clearly defined group, or individuals
- provided a range of opinions, feelings or viewpoints pertaining to their individual/group, showing an understanding of complexities and nuance, and described them in depth.

QUESTION THREE

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:

- described some limited reference to importance, effect or extent, without support, or without accurate support
- focused on how the event was important to NZ at the time
- used bullet points which limited ability to provide linked description
- provided limited accurate detailed information
- making broad and generalised statements with little factual supporting evidence
- described the impact upon individuals rather than society, and often described that impact in terms of intangible or vague impacts, such as “scarred for life” or “had to live with the memories of...”

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:

- attempted to describe how the event was of significance to New Zealand but may have made no reference to importance, effect or extent
- supported description with inaccurate information
- attempted to relate the event to NZ but this may have been inaccurate or irrelevant.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- described aspects of the significance of the event in detail
- made reference to importance, effects and extent in some depth, evidence may be irrelevant
- made few errors
- included some relevant examples and factually supporting evidence
- linked the event with changes or effects felt in NZ society as a whole, rather than simply upon individuals. Often provided examples that were difficult to quantify or exemplify, such as “everyone was angry with the French”.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- explained the significance of the event
- made reference to importance, effects and extent (the three bullet points) and did so in a manner that was convincing, supported with relevant and factual evidence
- referred to a range of aspects of the significance of the event
- demonstrated an excellent range of factual evidence and specific examples.

OTHER COMMENTS

Some candidates chose an event that was too broad, e.g. WWII, which meant they were a little too general in their description; it's an approach that limits the opportunity to be specific and demonstrate comprehensive knowledge; or they chose an event that afforded little opportunity to describe meaningful perspectives for Q2, and long-term consequences, Q3. A good example of this was the Wahine Disaster. Most candidates were not only limited in their description, they knew little of (say) the perspectives of the survivors or Captain Robinson. Then when they came to Q3, apart from a generalised ‘New Zealanders were shocked’ they could not demonstrate any knowledge of the long-term impact on New Zealand society.

Candidates did have some difficulty covering off the three bullet points in question three, especially how the event impacted on New Zealand society. Topic choice often restricted candidates. Without supporting evidence candidates made too many generalisations.