

Subject: History

Level: 3

Standards: 91436, 91438, 91439

Part A: Commentary

A common indicator of success across all three standards was evidence of planning. Candidates who planned a response accurately responded to the question, used relevant evidence to support their generalisations, and were able to sustain their analysis or argument across their entire response.

The choice of historical event/trend for the two essay standards was very important and is discussed in detail in the standard-specific responses. Some candidates chose events that were not historically insignificant, or events that were too recent.

Part B: Report on standards

91436: Analyse evidence relating to an historical event of significance to New Zealanders

Examination

The Assessment Specifications indicated that the context for 2022 would be “politics in sport in the second half of the twentieth century”. The examination focused on the decision to continue the 1972 Munich Olympic Games after a terrorist attack.

There were three historical concepts that were assessed using this context: perspectives, continuity and change, and reliability and usefulness.

The questions required candidates to apply their understanding of the historical concepts to the information contained in the supplied historical sources and use evidence selected from the sources to support an analytical response.

Observations

Candidates readily engaged with the resource material about the 1972 Munich Olympic Games. Those who were well prepared for “politics in sport” generally could more

accurately place the 1972 Munich Olympic Games topic into the context. Candidates who included relevant information about other “politics in sport” examples gave themselves an opportunity to do well.

Candidates tended to engage with the sources sequentially rather than processing the evidence and then making a coherent response. Candidates who planned, made a relevant generalisation in response to the prompt, then supported that generalisation with carefully selected specific evidence did well.

The concept of continuity and change was not well understood by many candidates. Candidates who were able to evaluate whether there was more change or more continuity performed better than those who identified the existence of the concept in the sources.

Ensuring that all the concepts listed in the standard are familiar to ākonga is a key part of effective teaching and learning.

Candidates who utilised frameworks or mnemonics to assess the sources, particularly when assessing the usefulness and reliability of sources, generally performed better than those who did not. Ākonga who were able to identify where aspects of their mnemonics did not apply kept their responses relevant and concise.

Those candidates who were able to identify missing voices (particularly in the perspectives question) performed well, as did those who were able to specifically address limitations in the sources and identify possible ways to address these limitations as a historian.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- used a limited amount of relevant evidence from the sources in their response
- made generalised comments in response to the questions with limited use of evidence
- understood the historical concepts, although this understanding was often implied rather than explicit.

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

- misinterpreted the sources
- did not demonstrate understanding of the historical concepts being assessed
- did not use evidence in their responses.

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

- understood the historical concepts and were able to accurately apply them to the sources
- interpreted the sources accurately, in both their content and context
- provided several generalisations that addressed the question and supported those ideas with relevant evidence

- wrote responses that were more than just narrative or a sequential run through of the sources.

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

- understood the ideas contained in the sources and how they supported or contradicted each other
 - understood the historical concepts and could thoroughly explain how the sources illustrated these concepts
 - demonstrated a high degree of engagement with the sources
 - used carefully selected evidence to support an argument
 - analysed the context of the source as well as its content
 - wrote responses that began with generalisations and supported this generalisation with specific examples from the sources.
-

91438: Analyse the causes and consequences of a significant historical event

Examination

The 2022 examination did not require candidates to write about both the causes and consequences of a selected historical event.

The question asked candidates to evaluate the extent to which the consequences of a significant historical event affected people's lives in both the short and long term.

Candidates responded to the stimulus in an essay format, using a historical event of their own choice as the context. An evaluation of the consequences of the chosen event was required, with candidates evaluating the consequences' effect on the lives of people and supporting their argument with relevant historical evidence.

Observations

Candidates who performed well tended to address the causal relationship between the event and the consequence within their response. This enabled them to make perceptive explanations of how each consequence affected people's lives and to discuss the complexity of the extent to which people's lives are affected in the short and long term.

Candidates who chose a specific and historically significant event performed well. Ensuring that ākonga have chosen to study suitable historic events is a key element of effective teaching and learning. Disasters, whether natural or man-made do not usually have the complexity required to reach the Excellence criteria. Events that are too recent are also unsuitable for a proper historical analysis.

Candidates whose events were broad, e.g. the Second Indochina War, the New Zealand Wars, the French Revolution, often wrote about the event itself rather than the consequences that flowed from the event. Those students who wrote on the New Zealand

Wars (Ngā Pakanga o Aotearoa) failed to acknowledge that there were different consequences for each key war, such as the consequences that flowed from the Northern War (1945–1946) are different to those that flowed from the first Taranaki War (1860–1861).

Candidates who kept their essays concise, choosing the two most important consequences (and explaining which of these was the most important) performed well.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- wrote clearly
- showed some understanding of their chosen event but coverage of the event was limited and there was limited explanation of the consequences
- chose events that did not have strong consequences or were events that did not have strong relevance to people's lives
- discussed two consequences but did not consistently address the specific question in terms of examining the extent to which people's lives were affected in the short and long term
- wrote about straightforward consequences, such as a statistics-based discussion of casualties; or wrote about complex consequences in a straightforward way, such as the War on Terror as a consequence of 9/11
- selected consequences that may not be convincingly linked to the event or failed to make the link in a convincing way, such as stating that the Native Schools Act 1967 was passed because of the outbreak of war in Waikato (1863) without explaining how the war and legislation are linked
- quoted historians' points but did not incorporate these into an argument
- selected predominantly accurate basic facts and evidence to support their explanation
- wrote a conclusion to summarise what had already been said rather than drawing a conclusion in relation to the essay question or prioritising the consequences.

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

- wrote about a historic event in either a poorly defined or unsuitable way
- wrote informally, commonly without 'sign-posting' language or a clear paragraph and essay structure
- discussed only one valid consequence
- wrote about causes instead of consequences, or did not explain how the event affected people's lives, or chose consequences that, while chronologically after the historic event, had no causal relationship to the event
- wrote a narrative account of the event with little or no analysis of consequences
- showed little knowledge of the event or its consequences

- included little relevant historical evidence
- made broad unsubstantiated generalisations.

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

- selected a well-considered significant historical event, suitable for NCEA Level 3
- planned a response carefully to address the question
- addressed specifically and continually linked back to the question
- used a clear structure to show understanding of historical chronology and causation, clearly linking the consequences to the event
- used clear topic sentences that introduced or categorised the consequences
- showed sound understanding of their chosen event and its context
- examined two distinct consequences that could be developed in some depth, using multiple examples, or convincing arguments about short-term and long-term effects, or different effects for different groups of people
- developed an argument as to why the consequences were important and linked this to the extent to which people's lives were affected in the short term and the long term
- provided accurate and relevant evidence and examples to support how the consequences affected people's lives
- showed a deeper understanding of a consequence by developing a short- to long-term argument within that consequence
- attempted to prioritise the consequences and justify that prioritisation.

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

- planned a response carefully to address the question
- selected a well-considered significant historical event, suitable for NCEA Level 3
- structured their response in a cohesive manner by presenting the argument in a logical sequence of paragraphs
- took a clear position regarding the consequences in an introduction and sustained this argument throughout the response by consistently linking back to the question, using evaluative terminology
- demonstrated discernment in their choice of two important consequences that each had an impact on people's lives in both the short and long term
- showed strong understanding of, and insight into, the complexity of their chosen consequences and wove this throughout their argument
- related the event and its consequences to a broader historical context
- included well-considered, well-chosen evidence and examples that supported their argument by developing ideas and supporting their points
- included comprehensive supporting evidence (statistics, specific examples, primary evidence, quotes), accompanied by their own explanation

- justified their evaluation of the relative importance of consequences clearly, often in a separate paragraph
 - used the conclusion to go beyond what had already been stated in the essay
 - wrote concisely, avoiding repetition and redundancy.
-

91439: Analyse a significant historical trend and the force(s) that influenced it

Examination

The 2022 examination question asked candidates to evaluate the changes that occurred because of a significant historical trend.

Candidates responded to the stimulus in an essay format, using a historical trend of their own choice as the context. An evaluation of the changes that occurred because of the trend was required, with candidates arguing which of the changes was the most important and supporting their argument with relevant historical evidence.

Observations

The choice of an appropriate topic is important. While many ākonga chose interesting and historically complex topics, others chose topics that were unsuitable at Level 3, either being too historically recent, or lacking the depth required.

Candidates were generally able to use short-term time frames to illustrate the trend

There was a clear trend toward using Aotearoa New Zealand topics.

The use of appropriate historiography by ākonga in their response is one way of ensuring that comprehensive evaluation is being made.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- wrote an extensive narrative, rather than explaining changes
- used rote-learned content
- followed a basic essay structure
- used a limited range of evidence to support their argument.

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

- used rote-learned content instead of addressing the essay prompt
- gave insufficient examples
- did not use historical writing conventions
- used evidence that was not directly relevant.

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

- were able to evaluate the changes that occurred and attempted to prioritise them
- began to explain the extent of the changes and any limitations of those changes
- clearly articulated explanations and evaluations in their response
- used a clear essay structure, appropriate terminology, and other sign-posting language to make their ideas and argument clear
- incorporated relevant evidence into their arguments.

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

- showed evidence of preparation and planning by using carefully curated, relevant evidence to thoughtfully support their argument
- wrote concisely, avoiding repetition and irrelevancies
- made connections between ideas, illustrating relationships between the trends, and resulting changes
- explained the limitations of the changes that occurred, demonstrating insight into the complexity of the trend.