

2024 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	History
Level:	1
Achievement standard(s):	92026, 92027

General commentary

Successful candidates were well prepared, responded to the questions asked, and provided relevant historical evidence to support their responses.

Selection of the historical context remains very important for both standards and is discussed in more detail in the standard-specific reports. Candidates should be careful to use contexts where people or groups have clear perspectives and responses and allow for the unpacking of historical concepts.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

Achievement standard 92026: Demonstrate understanding of historical concepts in contexts of significance to Aotearoa New Zealand

Assessment

This was an end-of-year examination. The examination required candidates to respond to one question consisting of three parts. Stimulus material was made available at the start of Term 4 for candidates to familiarise themselves with the context of the assessment, and a resource booklet was provided on the day of the assessment. The context provided was Ngā Tamatoa and Te Petihana Reo Māori (The Māori Language Petition) 1972. Candidates were required to demonstrate an understanding of two specified historical concepts (mana and cause) in the context of the resource material provided. Candidates were also required to demonstrate an understanding of one of these historical concepts in a familiar (studied) context.

Commentary

Candidates performed well when they used more of the sources provided to help answer parts (a) and (b). For the historical concept cause, using terms like short-term cause and long-term cause, helped to give structure to their response. The use of a strong paragraph structure, while not a requirement of the standard, aids the clarity of candidates' responses and achievement levels. Candidates need to be clear about their historical context for part (c) and be sure they are writing about the causes, not consequences. Candidates showed that they understand what mana is and explained how we can see mana in the source material and their studied context by discussing how mana was enhanced, diminished, or gained, with very clear examples. Other candidates were able to break mana down into different types, such as mana tupuna and mana tangata, and apply their answer to the source material and their studied context. Candidates need to think carefully about the choice of concept for part (c). Some candidates struggled to link mana to some non-New Zealand contexts (such as the Czechoslovakian Crisis, Kristallnacht, or 9/11), where a response that focused on cause would have been more appropriate. In some of these responses, a lack of understanding of mana was evident. The 1981 Springbok tour was a popular topic but had mixed success. Candidates

needed to be clear whether they were discussing the cause of the tour itself, or the protests against the tour. Many candidates were not clear about this within their answer. The Civil Rights movement is too broad, but a specific event from the Civil Rights Movement, such as the Birmingham Campaign, the Montgomery Bus Boycott, or the March on Washington, may produce higher-level responses. Many of the responses to disaster events such as the Mount Erebus crash described the event and responses in detail, but did not explicitly link to the concept, simply adding a closing phrase, such as “as a result of their work, this showed mana”.

Topics that worked well because candidates could confidently apply either cause or mana to these contexts included (but were not limited to):

- the 1975 Māori Land March
- the 1977–1978 Bastion Point protest
- the Polynesian Panthers or the Dawn Raids.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- answered all parts of the exam
- provided descriptive or narrative answers
- used only one source per answer for parts (a) and (b)
- used terms such as “the source shows” or “the source says”
- provided more generic evidence to support part (c)
- supported descriptions with relevant evidence
- generalised the concept, discussing it in broad terms without identifying specific aspects
- copied evidence from the sources and went onto to paraphrase the meaning, not the significance of the evidence, such as “this means that ...”, rather than “this evidence shows ...”
- answered one concept more thoroughly and convincingly than the other
- recited the sources word for word, with a follow up sentence that described how it showed the concept.

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

- explained the two concepts in two different historical contexts successfully
- answered all parts of the exam
- provided clear explanation in their answers
- used a range of sources to support their ideas
- took a source-by-source approach to parts (a) and (b), leading to a less complex explanation
- used terms such as “this led to”; “this shows ... because ...” in their answers
- described the sources first and then wrote a sentence at the end that explained how that linked to Ngā Tamatoa / Te Petihana Reo Māori, thus limiting their ability to achieve at a higher level
- defined the concept they had discussed clearly
- considered aspects of the concept, such as long term or short-term causes, or mana tūpuna that demonstrated a deeper understanding
- explained using evidence how the concepts related to the context in the source material and their own studied context
- attempted to link how the source related to the concept
- demonstrated understanding of mana and explained how mana can be seen in both the source material and studied context by discussing how mana was enhanced, diminished, or gained, with very clear examples.

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

- supported fully their explanation with a range of relevant and well-considered historical evidence across all three parts
- used a range of sources from the source material to demonstrate an understanding of how the concepts related to the context using specific and valid evidence
- organised ideas logically with a clear structure to build their argument
- displayed a very clear understanding of the concepts, extracting only the most relevant information, rather than summarising the entire source
- knew how to analyse and interpret how the sources reflect the concepts
- began with their own ideas and then used the evidence, from the sources or their own knowledge, to support this, rather than the other way around
- considered a variety of aspects of the concept that showed depth of understanding and insight
- demonstrated their understanding by drawing conclusions about the link between the concepts and contexts that went beyond the sources
- examined the sources critically and provided detailed explanations, such as “this caused them to feel most deprived from their language because ...”
- made key connections between the given concepts (mana and / or cause) and other concepts such as tūrangawaewae or tuakiri, or the big ideas of history (although not required by the standard, this would often show that the candidate knew how to examine the concepts across the contexts).

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

- did not answer all parts of the exam
- answered parts (a) and (b), but their choice of topic for part (c), or their answer, was not sufficient to show understanding of the concepts in another context
- used the context provided in the source material for part (c), instead of using a context that was studied in class
- copied the definitions from the resource booklet without further unpacking
- did not support their ideas with evidence, often for part (c)
- did not use the concept in their response, therefore did not show a link between their evidence and the concept
- provided a narrative of the event without addressing the concept(s)
- discussed the event or historical context, rather than the cause.

Achievement standard 92027: Demonstrate understanding of perspectives on a historical context

Assessment

This was a school-managed assessment with candidates required to complete a report over time in class, within a recommended timeframe of four hours. The report required candidates to respond to a task on why the beliefs of individuals or groups from a chosen historical context influenced how they responded to a historical event, person, or place. The chosen historical context could have been an event, person, place, group of people, or historical movement. The task instructions provided a series of scaffolded bullet points of what could have been included in the candidate's response. Candidates were encouraged to limit their responses to no more than 1200 words, or 4 minutes of audio / video.

Commentary

In general, candidates responded to the standard using appropriate contexts with clear differing perspectives. Where candidates had difficulty, it was often the case that the context was not clear, such as attempts to cover the whole of the Civil Rights movement in the USA, rather than a focus on one campaign; or the perspectives / responses were speculative, or without sufficient evidence to support them. Some responses became caught up in an overly narrative approach, or focused on causes and consequences, without having the perspectives of individuals or groups as the focus, limiting the overall grade. Overly structured scaffolding in responses can mean that candidates are not able to “discuss” their context fully and may limit their ability to gain Excellence.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- identified a context clearly with two different perspectives and associated responses
- identified and described the ways in which the beliefs of two individuals or groups from the chosen historical context influenced how they responded to an event, person, or place
- structured responses well
- included evidence to support their ideas.

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

- identified and explained a context clearly with two different perspectives and associated responses
- explained the ways in which the beliefs of two individuals or groups from the chosen historical context influenced how they responded to an event, person, or place
- explained how / why their chosen perspectives differed
- structured responses clearly and concisely
- included relevant and accurate evidence to support both perspectives and responses.

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

- identified and discussed a context clearly with two different perspectives and associated responses
- discussed the ways in which the beliefs of two individuals or groups from the chosen historical context influenced how they responded to an event, person, or place
- integrated a discussion of the wider historical context related to the event into discussion of the perspectives and responses, rather than including the wider context as an isolated introduction or conclusion
- included a discussion of how / why their chosen perspectives differed
- selected and included a range of relevant and accurate evidence to support their ideas
- structured responses clearly and concisely.

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

- identified one perspective only or the perspectives were unbalanced
- did not include clear responses to the event based on perspectives
- wrote a historical narrative, rather than explicitly highlighting perspectives and responses
- included very limited or inaccurate historical evidence to support their ideas.