

## 2024 NCEA Assessment Report

<b>Subject:</b>	History
<b>Level:</b>	3
<b>Achievement standard(s):</b>	91436, 91438, 91439

### General commentary

Candidates who understood the historical concepts used in the questions and prompts, and who clearly and explicitly applied the concepts in their responses, experienced success. These responses typically demonstrated planning and / or preparation, rather than a superficial, rote-learned response.

Topic selection remains very important for the essay standards.

### Report on individual achievement standard(s)

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

##### Assessment

The examination required candidates to answer three questions, using evidence from the sources provided, to contextualise their understanding of a historical concept. The sources provided were about the 1905 'Originals' All Blacks rugby tour to Great Britain.

##### Commentary

Candidates readily engaged with the sources, and many took the opportunity to identify (and criticise) the colonial and patriarchal nature of New Zealand society in 1905. The range of sources enabled capable students to demonstrate their ability. The use of a quote as part of Question Three did not seem to confuse or deter candidates.

Less confident candidates continue to overuse the sources in their responses. This made it difficult for them to demonstrate their own understanding of the historical concept being examined.

##### Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- extracted evidence source by source, with only limited reference to the historical concept
- addressed sources in isolation from each other without making connections
- demonstrated understanding of the historical concept less explicitly than those who gained higher grades
- relied on the source material, rather than extracting relevant evidence
- interpreted most sources accurately.

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

- organised their response through categorising, such as 'short-term', or 'political' and 'cultural'
- demonstrated connections between sources and evidence that discussed similar examples of the concept being assessed
- made clear generalisations, supporting those with specific evidence
- interpreted the sources accurately.

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

- interpreted the sources accurately and in a nuanced manner
- demonstrated an understanding of the wider social / political context of 1905
- applied conceptual frameworks, especially when considering significance
- used carefully selected, relevant evidence to support carefully framed generalisations
- demonstrated a thorough understanding of the concepts being assessed, especially how motivations, backgrounds, and identity can shape perspectives.

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

- misinterpreted aspects of the sources
- overquoted the sources
- did not offer their own explanation of the concept
- wrote explanations without supporting evidence
- completed two or fewer questions out of three.

---

## **Achievement standard 91438: Analyse the causes and consequences of a significant historical event**

### **Assessment**

The examination required candidates to answer an essay question, evaluating two consequences of a significant historical event, and why one of those two consequences was more significant than the other.

### **Commentary**

Stronger candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of the context or conditions in which the event occurred and were able to explicitly connect the consequences to the historical event. A significant number of candidates provided only cursory discussion of the event or omitted contextual background altogether.

Candidates who achieved higher grades generally employed some type of framework to compare consequences. This helped candidates analyse and clearly compare two consequences, rather than focusing on one in isolation. A simple framework often employed was one based on quantity, such as around the numbers of lives lost or casualties for comparison purposes. More sophisticated frameworks utilised some or all aspects of a framework such as Counsell's or Partington's.

Some events are not suitable for this standard. Candidates should select a specific and historically significant event and avoid events based on natural or man-made disasters, as these can make it difficult to meet the Excellence criteria.

Candidates should limit their essays to discussing two consequences as directed. Writing about a third often diluted the response, or limited the time available to discuss the prioritisation of the consequences, which is critical for Merit or above.

A concise response was not necessarily about answering the question in 900 words, but rather focused on two consequences and avoided redundancy, repetition, and irrelevance in the argument.

## Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- wrote clearly but provided limited coverage of their chosen event, often omitting important context, or including only a brief explanation of how the event came about
- discussed two valid consequences, but sometimes the second consequence was indirect, or a consequence of the first consequence
- selected mostly accurate but basic evidence to support their explanation
- attempted to discuss which consequence was most significant but failed to compare the consequences effectively.

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

- selected a significant historical event suitable for NCEA Level 3 and demonstrated sound understanding of the event and its context
- responded to both parts of the question with a clear structure and logical progression
- used topic sentences to introduce or categorise the two consequences being argued
- chose two distinct, direct consequences that could be discussed in depth
- developed an argument regarding the most significant consequence and attempted prioritisation, with high Merit candidates making clear comparisons between the two consequences
- provided relevant, specific evidence and examples that were largely error-free, demonstrating strong content knowledge
- dedicated a paragraph or the conclusion to justifying the most significant consequence, explaining why it was more significant than the other.

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

- chose a significant historical event that was specific, well-considered, and allowed for a complex understanding and analysis
- structured their response cohesively, presenting their argument in a logical sequence
- took a clear position on the most significant consequence in their introduction and sustained this argument throughout the essay
- demonstrated discernment in selecting two important, direct consequences and used them to build a perceptive argument
- used well-chosen evidence and examples to develop ideas and support their argument, avoiding excessive detail or tangential points
- addressed historiography (not a requirement for Excellence) and incorporated it to support their argument, rather than substituting it for their own analysis
- used the conclusion to synthesise ideas, make comparisons, or explain why the chosen consequences were particularly significant
- wrote concisely.

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

- chose an event that was vague, overly broad, or not historically significant
  - did not address which consequence was most significant and why
  - demonstrated limited or inaccurate knowledge of the event
  - discussed only one valid consequence or focused on causes, rather than consequences
  - described events chronologically subsequent to the event but not actual consequences
  - did not include sufficient accurate and relevant evidence, or repeated significant errors
  - made broad, unsubstantiated generalisations, which in some cases were inappropriate
  - wrote a narrative account of the event, with little to no analysis of the consequences
  - lacked clear structure, signposting language, or augmentation.
- 

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

### Assessment

The examination required candidates to answer an essay question, evaluating to what extent a significant historical trend caused change and continuity.

### Commentary

Candidates who chose appropriate topics and had a strong knowledge of their historical trend material did well and were able to accurately analyse changes and continuities that occurred because of the historical trend.

Candidates who did well tended to choose a clear and specific trend, such as the changing role of women, or changing attitudes to LGBTQ+, or New Zealand sovereignty. Some candidates are still choosing to write about events or individuals, making it difficult to achieve this standard.

### Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- addressed continuity or change, rather than both aspects of this concept
- provided limited evidence and examples
- followed a traditional essay structure
- explained their historical trend.

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

- demonstrated a depth of knowledge of their chosen topic
- addressed both continuity and change
- prioritised the most significant change or continuity.

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

- wrote a comprehensive and balanced essay with a sustained argument
- used evidence strategically to support their argument
- demonstrated an understanding of the complexity of the trend they were writing about
- evaluated the trend effectively
- addressed the question explicitly.

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

- identified a trend / force
- wrote a superficial response
- chose a topic that was not suited to this standard
- wrote in an unstructured, disorganised manner
- did not include evidence or examples.