

2015 NCEA Assessment Report

History Level 3 91436, 91438, 91439

Part A: Commentary

Candidates, in general, were well prepared and well able to respond to the demands of these Achievement Standards. Teachers and candidates are increasingly aware of the demands of the Assessment Standards and are working to ensure that those demands are met. As teachers and candidates continue to become familiar with the key word in each Achievement Standard – analyse – the ability of candidates to demonstrate critical thinking will increase.

Part B: Report on standards

1. Assessment Report for 91436: Analyse evidence relating to an historical event of significance to New Zealanders

Achieved	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • were able to analyse the sources to explain historical concepts • provided an accurate narrative response to the question • generally were able to comprehend the source material • included limited evidence from the sources to support their ideas • wrote general answers that while answering the question, did not analyse the sources in detail • misinterpreted one of the sources specified in the question • wrote brief answers which correctly explained the required historical concepts but did not expand on these concepts in terms of the context of the question.
Not Achieved	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • misunderstood the questions • wrote superficial responses • misunderstood the sources • provided no, or irrelevant, evidence from the sources or used inappropriate sources as the basis of their response • did not complete all of the questions • regurgitated the sources as their response to the question.
Achieved with Merit	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provided detailed answers that analysed historical concepts in depth • used a range of specific evidence from the sources that supported their answers • answered all parts of the question in detail • demonstrated an understanding of both the content and context of the sources.
Achieved with Excellence	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • analysed the context of sources in their answer • explained the complexity of events and their relationship to each other • explained issues with the sources, in particular omissions and bias • commented on this historical context of the subject matter • understood the difference between contemporary and modern perspectives • showed a sophisticated understanding of historical concepts • provided detailed and specific references to sources to support their answers • analysed comprehensively the reliability and usefulness of the sources, using the appropriate terms for each concept.
Standard specific comments	<p>More candidates are able to demonstrate an understanding of the difference between reliability and usefulness, although this area of critical thinking continues to be an aspect of source analysis where some candidates are unable to work with confidence.</p>

2. Assessment Report for 91438: Analyse the causes and consequences of a significant historical event

<p>Achieved</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> analysed or explained the causes of a significant historical event by making links between the causes and the event analysed or explained the consequences of a significant historical event by making links between the consequences and the event covered both causes and consequences, even though the coverage might not be equally balanced demonstrated some understanding of the most important underlying and immediate causes as well as of the short term and long term consequences provided some evidence in support of the causes and the consequences, typically attempting an essay structure that included an introduction, a series of linked paragraphs and a conclusion.
<p>Not Achieved</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> wrote a narrative or description rather than an analysis of the causes and consequences of a historical event neglected to cover both causes and consequences, often describing one them generally and without specific supporting detail demonstrated little understanding by making repeated and concerning errors about the context of the event selected a limited or overly broad historical event that did not give them sufficient depth for a Level 3 argument about the causes and consequences of the event.
<p>Achieved with Merit</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> analysed in depth the causes and consequences of a significant historical event on the lives of people demonstrated sound understanding by making clear and reasoned explanations of the links between the causes and consequences and the event evaluated the prioritisation of causes and consequences with some attempt at justification of their relative significance provided appropriate evidence in support of the causes and the consequences, typically in an essay structure that included an introduction, a series of linked paragraphs and a conclusion.
<p>Achieved with Excellence</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> analysed comprehensively the causes and consequences of a significant historical event on the lives of people demonstrated understanding of the complexity of the causes and consequences by making persuasive explanations of the links between them and the event evaluated with well-considered judgements that weighed up the relative significance of the causes and consequences provided detailed evidence in support of the causes and the consequences, typically in an effective essay structure, including an introduction, a series of linked paragraphs and a conclusion.
<p>Standard specific comments</p>	<p>Candidates should ensure they select a well-defined, specific historical event – e.g. “the invasion of Parihaka 5th November, 1881” rather than “the Parihaka movement”. Some events selected were simply not significant enough to analyse and evaluate causes and consequences to the depth required for a level 3 standard. Some candidates also tried to write an answer with material from internal assessments held earlier in their year without altering the information to answer the set question for this achievement standard.</p> <p>Candidates for this standard were commonly well prepared and wrote quite extensive</p>

	<p>answers. A number of scripts were more than 20 pages long. However, writing at such a length did not necessarily add value and sometimes the argument produced actually worked against the candidate attempting to show they could be both comprehensive and persuasive. All candidates would benefit from recognising the value of quality over quantity.</p> <p>Overt reference to causes and consequences throughout the essay did help candidates to ensure that their answers were targeting the question and to clarify their own thinking. The causes and consequences used should not be random causes and consequences drawn from a possible list but be explicitly linked to the event relate to the question asked and be substantiated with significant supporting evidence.</p> <p>The best candidates made excellent use of the planning page to help structure their response, evaluated their causes and consequences, and used memorised quotes from historians to enhance their argument for the relative importance of their causes and consequences.</p>

3. Assessment Report for 91439: Analyse a significant historical trend and the forces) that influenced it

Achieved	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> answered both parts of the question but with a focus on one part that diminished the ability to discuss the second part in detail: a tendency to discuss/explain the different forces and little discussion/explanation of the ways in which different groups of people were impacted. examined forces but did not develop an argument as to which force was the key force that influenced the trend: there was no actual analysis/evaluation. discussed changes to people's lives in a basic or general manner with little or only some supporting evidence a reliance on narrative to address the question: sound knowledge but a catalogue of information rather than a focus on creating an argument.
Not Achieved	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> answered one part of the question only wrote a narrative account of an event that did not into account forces impacting on a trend made broad generalisations that were not supported by specific supporting evidence wrote a substantial portion of their answer with inaccurate content presented ideas and information in a muddled manner with little structure wrote an essay that did not address the 2015 question.
Achieved with Merit	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> answered both components of the question and provided fairly balanced coverage of both components of the question showed evidence of planning that engaged with both components of the question used structure well to develop writing: e.g. an introduction that briefly answered the question, topic sentences that linked to the question, logical sequencing of paragraphs analysed the key force that influenced the trend, relative to other forces and developed a convincing argument that was supported by relevant evidence discussed changes and/or continuities to different groups of people's lives with clear and valid connections to the trend developed a sustained argument that examined changes to different groups of people's lives or undertook an evaluation that demonstrated understanding of how the trend changed people's lives.
Achieved with Excellence	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> undertook a comprehensive planning process prior to writing, directly linking planning to all of the key components of the essay question including examining continuity

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • wrote fluently, persuasively, and with perception and insight • showed breadth and depth of understanding when evaluating the key force, relative to other forces, that influenced a trend • made judicious / well considered judgments as to the supporting evidence that was included to support key arguments • presented well considered evaluations/perceptive measurements of the significance of changes and continuity to different groups of people’s lives as a result of the trend • allocated a significant portion of writing time to the development of a persuasive argument as to the changes and/or continuities to different groups of people’s lives • wrote with authority, and displayed an ability to cover a range of issues/contexts/events • used historiography in a seamless manner that did not detract from the overall evaluation/or did not substitute historiography for independent well developed conclusions.
<p>Standard specific comments</p>	<p>There was an increase in the number of well-written essays that not only addressed the question but were able to display excellent content knowledge. Candidates are clearly well able to deconstruct the question and to respond to the demands not just of the question but of the Achievement Standard.</p> <p>Unfortunately, there were also candidates who had little understanding of the requirements of the Achievement Standard and who, in responding to the question and in supporting their work with excellent knowledge, failed to create an argument and were unaware of the Achievement Standard’s focus on ‘analysis’.</p> <p>It is important that teachers are familiar with the demands of the AS and also become familiar with the AS specifications as set out in the annual document. Some candidates struggled to respond to the question, preferring to write a response to a question from a previous exam. Candidates who approach an examination with a prepared response will always be at a disadvantage.</p>