

National Certificate of Educational Achievement

2014 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

Overall the calibre of the candidate responses across the three standards was high. There were some topics which allowed candidates to write in both breadth and depth, and using relevant and accurate evidence to support and strengthen their responses. In both 91005 and 91006 the issue of candidates choosing topics that were either too broad or too narrow was raised.

Grade score marking was used across all three papers. 91003 and 91006 were marked as three separate questions.

STANDARD REPORTS

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

ACHIEVEMENT

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

- had a reasonable concept in use of what an impact was and selected some relevant evidence from sources to support their understanding
- were often did not make the the distinction between “impact on society” – Question 1 – and “people’s response to” Question 2
- attempted to put their response in their own words
- identified two responses but one could be weak and/or confused
- used evidence to attempt to support ideas, however this may have been irrelevant at times or mentioned a source without using information from that source to support their ideas
- outlined why the oral source was useful and/or reliable and attempted to support their ideas by referencing the material in the resource booklet
- showed some insight into the strengths and issues around oral sources
- demonstrated some historical thinking skills by aattempted to discuss issues of usefulness and reliability of the oral source.

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 commonly:

- wrote about responses rather than impacts in question one
- quoted, or extracted evidence, with no attempt to put the material in their own words or, at least, provide some contextual description (i.e. interpret as the standard requires)
- did not include enough relevant evidence to support their ideas
- offered little description beyond an initial statement of the response
- offered only one answer to how people responded to the tour
- simply copied large passages of irrelevant material from the sources without linking it to the responses

- referred to the oral source alone OR did not refer to it at all and confined their discussion to the resource booklet - often only part thereof – not acknowledging any need/use for additional research to try to resolve new/unanswered questions or contradictions in the existing evidence
- attempted to answer the question or had limited answer with no evidence to back up ideas
- wrote in very general terms about reliability and/or usefulness with no reference to any of the source material
- failed to address this particular question and wrote about impacts and/or responses hence showing no understanding of reliability or usefulness.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

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

- interpreted the sources and described at least two impacts with supporting evidence
- started to show an understanding that different parts of NZ Society were impacted to a greater or lesser extent – not everybody was affected the same
- used their own words to answer the question and used specific evidence from a range of sources to back up ideas
- provided evidence from a range of sources while avoiding extra information that did not directly address the question
- identified the source of their information correctly or paraphrased information from
- clearly established and explained two different responses using relevant and directed evidence
- chose opposite responses to more clearly show the differences
- made frequent use of relevant evidence from the sources as either direct quotes or paraphrasing
- clearly understood what a response was
- went beyond basic responses to collective responses, e.g. positive/negative or older people with more than one example or younger people with more than one example
- discussed the issues around using oral sources in history with some knowledge
- made sound comparisons between oral and written sources and discussed how they could be used to mutually verify evidence
- interpreted the question correctly and used the resource booklet to back up their conclusions about the oral source
- independent historical thinking used or implied at times, questioned the sources/evidence
- showed a good understanding of the idea of reliability and/or usefulness
- concentrated mostly on the comparison of the oral source to the sources in the booklet and found areas of comparison and difference
- referred to the importance of using other sources to check reliability
- understood that an oral source on its own has some usefulness to an historian and explained this
- wrote clearly and concisely, directly answering the set question in their own words supported with referenced sources.

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:

- showed a clear understanding of the requirements of the question and presented coherent and full descriptions making use of evidence from the sources put in context by their own explanations
- were able to identify a range of social impacts and identify different responses from different social groups: evidence provided is comprehensively explained
- synthesised the evidence to clearly explain different impacts on different sectors of NZ society
- used own words and weaved evidence into their answers and answered the question comprehensively, selected appropriate evidence to back up their ideas
- clear, concise and straight to the point answers that were easy to read and follow and answered the question
- wrote extensively and fluidly
- outlined two responses in detail with comprehensive evidence, discussed what the responses told us about society at that time
- used own words and weaved extensive evidence into their answers
- made insightful comments about responses
- used relevant evidence extensively, as either direct quotes or paraphrased material
- showed greater insight into the specifics of the sources provided, their relative strengths and weaknesses and the processes historians use to verify evidence
- showed some sense of how historians using the material could use points of disagreement or unverified claims as a prompt to further research.
- showed an understanding that "reliability" was not the only criteria for "usefulness"
- answered the question and referenced the answer booklet also questioned the source by looking at motivation etc.
- clearly understood what the question asked and answered appropriately and comprehensively
- made extensive use of evidence from both the oral recollection and the other sources
- made insightful comments about reliability and/or usefulness in relation to the oral recollection
- demonstrated critical thinking and analysis
- identified new areas an historian may need to explore with the topic to gain more information to help back up the claims made in the oral source/ booklet sources which may not be accurate.

OTHER COMMENTS

Candidates should be aware that a source does not achieve greater authenticity simply BECAUSE it is either primary OR secondary in origin.

It was encouraging to see more candidates demonstrate some idea of the importance of a sources provenance but this should not be used as the sole determinant of "usefulness" or "reliability" in place of the skills of close reading and cross-referencing.

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 commonly:

- described at least one cause and at least one consequence of their chosen event
- included some evidence or supporting material that showed an understanding of the event, although this was often limited
- gave general descriptions that was often narrative and had irrelevant or unsubstantiated links to the event
- wrote an unbalanced essay, with the causes usually covered better than the consequences.

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 commonly:

- addressed only one part of the question - writing about either a cause or a consequence.
- wrote about everything they knew about the event without actually answering the question
- provided no factual examples to support statements
- wrote essays that were short and/or incomplete
- did not have a clear understanding of what the chosen event was.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

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

- displayed a strong content knowledge about the chosen event
- described in detail at least two causes and two consequences of the event
- linked the causes and consequences clearly to the event
- made appropriate and accurate use of supporting evidence such as names, people, places dates and relevant statistics to give more depth
- included more than one example per paragraph to provide added detail to their cause or consequence
- used topic sentences and structuring techniques to help keep the essay cohesive and coherent.

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 commonly:

- made comprehensive use of supporting evidence such as names, people, places dates and relevant statistics
- wrote a focussed essay that displayed a thorough understanding of the event
- used structuring techniques to help ensure essays were comprehensive and inclusive
- showed a clear understanding of linkage between the causes and consequences and the event.

OTHER COMMENTS

Overall the standard of essays was high and markers were pleased to be able to award a significant number of Merit and Excellence grades. Many candidates used the planning page and structured their essays accordingly.

Some of the best essays addressed a very specific event such as 9/11, execution of Louis XVI or storming of the Bastille. The most popular choices were the Montgomery Bus Boycott and the Birmingham Campaign. Candidates who chose broad or ill-defined events such as the stolen generation, rise of aggressive nations in the 1930's and the Japanese threat of invasion of NZ often had more difficulty gaining the higher grades.

Lack of a precise or succinct event made it difficult to separate causes and consequences, or identify relevant causes and consequences as there was no date or high point to focus the essay on. Candidates who continue to choose natural/man-made disasters (e.g. Pike River, Titanic, Tangiwai) had limited opportunities to gain Merit or Excellence grades.

91006 Describe how a significant historical event affected New Zealand society

ACHIEVEMENT

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

- provided an adequate description of a historical event and supported ideas with some accurate historical information
- described valid actions and reactions and supported these with some accurate supporting evidence
- provided a basic explanation as to why the event was significant to New Zealanders and/ or gave some insight into how the event affected New Zealanders and/or explain some of the impacts of the event had on New Zealand Society.

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 commonly:

- provided a description of a historic event that was not significant to New Zealand
- provided a basic description of a historic event that included significant factual errors or was lacking supporting evidence
- provided an inaccurate describe a relevant action or reaction and/ or individuals or key groups
- supported their ideas with anecdotal evidence or evidence that was unrelated to the action taken by an individual or group
- were unable to explain how the historical event was significant to New Zealanders and/ or the extent to which the event impacted the lives of New Zealanders or impacted on New Zealand Society
- ideas were unsupported with relevant or accurate evidence.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

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

- provided a detailed description of the historic event and provided relevant and accurate supporting evidence
- often wrote with conviction and a demonstrable structure to their answer
- were able to describe in detail and action and reaction related to the historical event
- were able to make valid links between actions and reactions supported by relevant historical evidence
- provided an explicit and detailed explanation as to why the event was significant to New Zealand and how the event affected individuals and New Zealand Society overall and/or demonstrated an in depth understanding of the historic event including its impact upon individuals and groups within New Zealand Society.

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 commonly:

- provided a comprehensive description of the historic event with accurate and relevant supporting evidence and supported ideas with historic evidence, including specific contexts, events, and personalities
- provided a crafted and correctly structured written response
- produced a comprehensive description of action and reaction and related it specifically to the historical event and provided specific evidence in support of their description of individual or group actions
- made valid and specific links between individuals and or groups relating to the action of person 1 and the reaction of person 2
- used a range of valid and relevant evidence to support their written response
- produced a logical and structured written response that addressed all aspects of the question
- produced a comprehensive and valid description, identifying explicitly why the event was of significance to New Zealand
- demonstrated an accurate understanding of the context of the event relative to the time period in which it occurred
- demonstrated a developed understanding of the impact of the event on New Zealand Society.

OTHER COMMENTS

A wide range of topics were covered, however the majority of candidates provided answers on either the Springbok Tour, The Rainbow Warrior, World War One or the influenza epidemic.

Some responses appear to have been prepared and commented upon the perspectives of people and, as a result, failed to adequately answer the question.

Topic selection had the potential to restrict candidate responses.