

Subject: History

Level: 2

Standards: 91231, 91233, 91234

Part A: Commentary

Candidates made a concerted effort to demonstrate their understanding of the standards offered in Level 2 History. While 91231 presented challenges for candidates, 91233 and 91234 (the essay standards) proved more accessible.

Part B: Report on standards

91231: Examine sources of an historical event that is of significance to New Zealanders

Examination

Question Two seemed more difficult for candidates to understand and was more frequently misinterpreted.

Observations

Candidates sitting digital examinations relied heavily on copy and pasting source material with less emphasis on synthesising the evidence into their answers and explaining it in their own words. Candidates should be made aware of the Roman numerals included in the source material in this standard.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- responded to the questions using some material from the sources
- included an understanding of similarities between the stories around the two individuals
- attempted an examination of the problems caused by myths
- demonstrated understanding of the reasons why a source could be considered reliable

- engaged with the sources and demonstrated that they understood what the questions were asking
- extracted material from the sources that were related to the key aspects of the questions.

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

- extracted source material without explaining in their own words
- did not demonstrate understanding of the historical concept
- included a large amount of irrelevant material
- constructed responses that did not make any reference to the source materials
- made personal observations that were not supported by source material.

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

- responded to the questions in their own words, using a range of source material to support their responses
- examined in some depth the problems caused by myths and how they influence people's understanding of history
- demonstrated an understanding of reliability and the limitations of a source for a historian and gave detailed examples
- addressed all three questions using accurate information and specific and valid source material.

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

- responded to the questions in a perceptive manner, explained in their own words, and used extensive evidence from the sources to support their responses
- showed insight that went outside the parameters of the source material
- demonstrated a clear understanding of problems caused by myth and how they influence history, using specific and well-chosen examples
- examined comprehensively a clear understanding of the reliability of at least one source
- demonstrated the limitations of source material and how historians may need to look further into the historical event and / or people at the time
- questioned the reliability of sources, showing a clear understanding of what makes a source reliable or not.

91233: Examine causes and consequences of a significant historical event

Examination

Responses indicate that most candidates readily understood the question and answered it as intended.

Observations

Most candidates who gained Achievement or above included evidence that lengthened their essays but still met the requirement for conciseness. Explicit events allowed candidates to better link their causes to the event.

Notably, some candidates writing at Merit and Excellence levels included historiography in their essays. This is not a requirement for Merit or Excellence at Level 2.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- wrote an overly long paragraph describing the event and its causes in the context paragraph
- presented a limited amount of supporting evidence, or the evidence that was not detailed
- presented limited explanation about why or how the cause was an important cause of the event
- used a conventional essay structure
- identified and explained two distinctly different causes of their chosen historical event
- presented at least three historically valid points comprising both information and explanation in examination of each cause
- presented detailed evidence but without sufficient explanation to demonstrate depth of understanding.

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

- identified two causes but without sufficient evidence or explanation
- did not use a conventional essay structure
- did not demonstrate understanding of literacy aspects such as paragraphs, capitalisation, and sentence structure
- identified only one cause
- did not examine two distinctly separate causes
- presented two causes so closely related that evidence and explanation was repeated.

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

- presented an explanation of how or why the cause was causal to the event
- linked points sequentially
- presented a range of detailed supporting evidence and in-depth understanding for both causes
- expanded on points with more than one sentence or example
- examined and often compared two distinctly separate causes

- identified and explained types of cause, such as underlying, long or short term, and trigger
- integrated the context paragraph into the introduction
- presented historiography but without sufficient explanation to demonstrate fuller depth of understanding.

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

- presented a developed analysis and evaluation of evidence
- made perceptive use of unpacked quotes and counter claims
- presented abundant detailed supporting evidence to make points utterly convincing
- demonstrated impressive depth of understanding
- presented historiography
- wrote in clear, concise, logical prose
- developed an argument throughout the response
- showed insightful understanding in a range of ways throughout the response
- contextualised the causes and event beyond their immediate scope
- presented evidence beyond the obvious
- made historically valid points that went beyond the obvious
- demonstrated superior understanding of historical causality
- presented a separate analysis and evaluation paragraph after the two causes.

91234: Examine how a significant historical event affected New Zealand society

Examination

Candidates seem well prepared for the assessment and demonstrated a sound understanding of the standard.

Observations

The introduction of Aotearoa New Zealand's histories has had a positive impact on the range of events that candidates have chosen to write about.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- examined an appropriate historical event that linked to the essay question
- identified and explained at least two impacts
- incorporated some relevant historical evidence
- wrote in an essay structure.

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

- discussed only one impact or no impacts
- provided a narrative of an event rather than an explanation
- did not provide accurate historical evidence to support their discussion
- made major historical errors
- discussed an event of no significance to New Zealanders.

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

- demonstrated a good understanding of their event
- supported their key ideas with detailed and accurate historical evidence, often including historiography
- applied an effective essay structure, writing in a logical and organised manner.

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

- demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of impacts that the historical event had on Aotearoa New Zealand society
- demonstrated insight via perceptive and, at times, original discussion, or conclusions
- effectively incorporated historical evidence, often beyond the obvious
- wrote in a concise and cogent manner, focusing on the significance of the impacts.