

2015 NCEA Assessment Report

History Level 1 91003, 91005, 91006

Part A: Commentary

Comment on the overall response of candidates to 2015 examinations for all achievement standards covered by this report.

Overall those candidates who were well prepared, planned their responses and applied their knowledge of historical thinking skills performed well in the examinations.

In relation to Achievement Standard 91005 and 91006, those candidates who were successful responded to the questions posed and applied well chosen content that was suitable for the standard and the questions. Well considered topic selection for these standards is important to ensure that candidate responses are not restricted. For Achievement Standard AS 91005 there are still a number of candidates failing to state directly the connection between each cause and the event.

In relation to Achievement Standard AS91003, those candidates who were successful had been taught historical thinking skills, how to unpack questions, and could read a range of historical sources, thereby allowing them to interpret the sources, select relevant perspectives and support answers with valid evidence.

Part B: Report on standards

1. Assessment Report for 91003: Interpret sources of an historical event of significance to New Zealanders

<p>Achieved</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • answered only one part of the question in question 1 • focused on Wake’s early life, awards or role as a secret agent • had less understanding of her work in the resistance • relied heavily on paraphrased information • selected enough evidence from the sources to identify actions in question 1 • provided some relevant evidence for both parts of the question for questions 1 and 2 • often quoted extensively with minimal linking in questions 1 and 2 • relied heavily on paraphrased information for question 2, particularly when describing Hickton or Wake’s perspective • made some attempt to interpret in their own words for at least one or two questions • had limited understanding of the concept of perspective • attempted to use evidence from more than one source in their responses • attempted to relate the idea of significance to Nancy Wake’s actions during World War II rather than just establish that she was or wasn’t a New Zealander • often defined “significance” as “importance” but could cite some relevant evidence • discussed significance implicitly as they attempted to answer the question in relation to New Zealand as an entity rather than New Zealanders • attempted at least two out of the three questions • wrote responses for at least two questions, which went beyond the minimum.
<p>Not Achieved</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • answered only one part of question • provided insufficient relevant evidence to address the questions • copied out large extracts from the sources, which didn’t address the questions • showed limited or no understanding of the idea of perspective • showed limited understanding by making little attempt to go beyond copying material from the sources • failed to attempt all three questions • wrote minimal responses • were unable to identify actions in WWII • were unable to identify a perspective in question 2

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> recounted what people of groups did in question 2 mis-identified groups and people in question 2 had no notion of significance in question 3.
Achieved with Merit	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provided relevant evidence from a range of sources across all three questions were able to select relevant evidence from the sources, which addressed the questions addressed all parts of the questions in their responses demonstrated an understanding of the intent of the questions in their responses used their own words with a degree of confidence to address the questions understood the ideas and concepts of perspective and significance.
Achieved with Excellence	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> showed a clear understanding of the requirements of the questions wrote comprehensive answers for the questions, with extensive relevant evidence from a number of sources made insightful comments, which clearly addressed the questions were able to synthesise relevant evidence with their own comments, where appropriate demonstrated superior historical thinking in their responses showed a sense of the question made some relevant points supported by evidence had a sound understanding of key concepts (such as “actions”, “perspectives”, “significance”) attempted to answer all parts of the question showed the ability to work and think as historians wrote structured, directed responses addressed the questions fully used evidence to support their statements.
Standard specific comments	<p>This standard requires the candidates to interpret sources, a skill which needs to be explicitly taught. Candidates need to be prepared to select, critique and apply evidence to the questions given, but it is clear from this particular exam that candidates need to understand historical thinking skills. This includes the interpretation of evidence (and what this means in an exam setting), the selection of relevant evidence, perspectives (and how we show an understanding of these) and significance. It is also clear that teachers need to teach candidates how to unpack questions and also how to respond appropriately to comprehension questions, such as question 1. Alongside this is a need for candidates to know how to read historical sources, and what to look for in these. Too many candidates found interpreting the sources difficult, and some simply totally misunderstood what they were saying.</p>

2. Assessment Report for 91005: Describe the causes and consequences of an historical event

Achieved	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> addressed both parts of the question (at least one cause and one consequence for an A3 grade, and two of each for the A4 grade) used some supporting evidence in the explanation but lacked detail (limited evidence) wrote a meaningful narrative with generally good structure, but no real depth attempted to use a logical structure.
Not Achieved	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> chose events that were poorly suited to the Achievement Standard did not answer both parts of the question – described either causes or consequences wrote invalid causes or consequences told a story rather than presenting an argument without describing the causes or

	<p>consequences (either explicitly or implicitly)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lacked structure making the answer difficult to follow • went off on a tangent • failed to link a cause to the chosen event • wrote vague answers, writing all they knew about the event rather than framing it as a cause and consequence essay • wrote too little to show understanding.
Achieved with Merit	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • described causes and consequences in detail, using appropriate supporting evidence • used an appropriate essay structure and a logical sequence was evident • linked causes and consequences explicitly to the event. • showed clear understanding, using examples and detail to show causal thinking.
Achieved with Excellence	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • wrote with a structure and style that showed clear and insightful understanding of the causes and consequences of the event • made connections between causes, consequences and the event were well established and comprehensively described. Main points were often reinforced in the linking • provided accurate detail that supported their discussion of the event • manifested a comprehensive grasp of the topic content and wrote with convincing structure and sophistication (relative to their age).
Standard specific comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An event from the Black Civil Rights topic is still the most common choice (particularly the Birmingham Campaign). The linking of causes and consequences to the event in this topic has significantly improved. - The choice of an appropriate event is important. Some topics limited the ability of candidates to reach the higher grades because of limited causes and/or consequences. These included the Erebus and Wahine disasters, the Tangiwai disaster and Aramoana massacre. - Other topics that candidates seemed to have particular difficulty in writing with clarity included 9/11 and the First Crusade. - Causes need to be specifically linked to the event rather than it be assumed that because they chronologically occurred before the event there must be some implied link. Many candidates knew the event but too many missed out on a grade they likely deserved because they didn't link causes or consequences. Simple phrases such as, "This was important because ..." "This was a cause because ..." This led to ..." would help establish a link. - Less able candidates who chose very broad events such as WW1 or WW2 often had difficulty in evaluating which information should be included and which should not. In these essays there was a tendency to give waffly answers that were often vague and general. Candidates who chose more specific events within these topics (e.g. Gallipoli, the Japanese invasion of Manchuria or the German invasion of Poland) tended to write more focussed, detailed and comprehensive answers.

3. Assessment Report for 91006: Describe how a significant historical event affected New Zealand society

Achieved	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provided an adequate description of a historical event • used some accurate historical information • described valid actions and reactions • used some supporting evidence • provided a basic explanation as to why the event was significant to New Zealanders • gave some insight into how the event affected New Zealanders • explained some of the impacts of the event on New Zealand Society.
-----------------	---

<p>Not Achieved</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • produced a description of a historical event that was incomplete • provided little or no supporting evidence • did not accurately describe a relevant action or reaction • provided anecdotal evidence only or made sweeping unsupported generalisations • manufactured evidence or provided evidence unrelated to the action taken by an individual or group • did not explain how the historical event was significant to New Zealanders • did not support their explanation with relevant or accurate evidence • did not explain accurately the extent to which the event impacted the lives of New Zealanders or impacted on New Zealand Society • were unable to demonstrate an accurate understanding of the historic event.
<p>Achieved with Merit</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provided a detailed description of the historic event and provided relevant and accurate supporting evidence • wrote with conviction and a demonstrable structure to their answer • were able to describe in detail the actions and reactions related to the historical event • made valid links between actions and reactions • used a range of supporting 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 • demonstrated an in depth understanding of the historic event including its impact upon individuals and groups within New Zealand Society.
<p>Achieved with Excellence</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provided a comprehensive description of the historic event with accurate and relevant supporting evidence • demonstrated a thorough understanding of the historic event, 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 • 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.
<p>Standard specific comments</p>	<p>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 1918 Influenza Epidemic. Topic selection had the potential to restrict candidate responses. 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 1918 Influenza Epidemic. Topic selection had the potential to restrict candidate responses.</p>

	<p>Some responses were prepared in advance and, as a result, failed to adequately answer the questions posed in the examination.</p> <p>Candidates generally demonstrated an improved ability to adequately describe the impact of the event on New Zealand Society. Some candidates tended to provide sweeping generalisations without supporting evidence.</p> <p>Candidates generally demonstrated an improved ability to adequately describe the impact of the event on New Zealand Society.</p>
--	--