

## 2025 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	History
Level:	3
Achievement standard(s):	91436, 91438, 91439

### General commentary

Successful candidates showed a clear understanding of the historical concepts and could apply these concepts in a relevant historical setting. Selection of a suitable essay event/trend and responding to the essay prompt were also important success factors for candidates.

### 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 show their understanding of the historical concepts of cause and effect, continuity and change, and significance. The sources provided were about Mira Százsy and her contributions to Te Rōpū Wāhine Māori Toko i te Ora (the Māori Women's Welfare League).

##### Commentary

Overall, candidates were very engaged with the subject material. Candidates found the concept of continuity and change the most difficult to evaluate in the sources. Those who used a significance framework to structure their response in Question Three tended to be able to analyse the sources in greater depth than those who did not.

Some candidates were well prepared to analyse the sources, using mnemonics like PLONK. However, this can lead to lengthy responses that do not directly address the questions. Successful candidates were able to use the most relevant aspects of these mnemonics and write accurate, concise, and insightful responses. Candidates who rewrote the sources rather than clearly focusing on the concepts specified in the question could not achieve higher grades.

##### Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- answered only one part of the question, such as continuity or change
- referred to the sources individually rather than identifying where sources supported each other
- provided limited evidence from the sources to support their answers
- engaged with the sources sequentially rather than synthesising generalisations from all relevant sources

- addressed the relevant concepts in an implicit manner rather than explicitly explaining a response to the question
- provided lengthy rewording of the source material to support their ideas rather than selecting the most relevant evidence.

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

- understood the historical concepts and were able to accurately apply them to the sources
- addressed both 'parts' of a historical concept, such as continuity and change
- 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 description of the sources.

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

- used a wide range of the most relevant evidence from the sources
- began each response with a clear argument that was maintained and supported throughout
- used categorisation and/or prioritisation to explore key ideas and assess their importance
- demonstrated a high level of engagement and understanding of the source material
- referred to sources other than those specified, where relevant
- utilised conceptual frameworks when analysing the sources, especially when analysing historical significance.

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

- misinterpreted the source material
- did not understand the historical concepts being assessed
- rewrote the source material rather than answering the question
- did not provide evidence from the sources in their responses.

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

### Assessment

The examination required candidates to answer an essay question, evaluating the extent to which the long-term consequences of a chosen historical event were more important than the short-term consequences.

### Commentary

Overall, candidates consistently interpreted the examination question accurately by focusing their discussion strictly on consequences. They avoided discussing causes or conflating the two, ensuring their response addressed the specific requirements of the standard.

Selection of appropriate historical events proved vital, with candidates who chose specific, discrete historical events rather than broad, multi-year periods performing better. This choice allowed for detailed analysis and prevented the response from becoming vague. Essays were written to a length that permitted depth, accuracy, and insight without losing analytical focus or becoming repetitive.

In their analysis, successful candidates identified two direct and valid consequences, establishing a clear and justified connection back to the historical event. They distinguished meaningfully between

short-term and long-term impacts rather than listing generic outcomes. Furthermore, successful candidates demonstrated higher-level thinking by explicitly justifying why one consequence carried greater significance than the other, basing these arguments on specific evidence.

## Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- chose a specific historical event
- demonstrated some understanding of both short-term and long-term consequences
- structured essays using clear, logical paragraphs
- explained consequences at a basic or descriptive level, with one consequence often developed more strongly than the other
- provided some relevant supporting evidence, although this was often limited or uneven
- made links between the event and its consequences, though these links often required the marker to infer connections
- attempted, often briefly, to argue that the long-term consequence was more important, though this was typically asserted rather than explained
- referred to the essay question in the introduction or conclusion rather than sustaining an argument throughout the response.

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

- selected two direct, appropriate consequences clearly linked to the event
- demonstrated sound understanding with clear explanations of how consequences arose
- explained importance, though sometimes unevenly
- evidence was accurate, specific, and mostly error-free
- maintained a logical structure that supported their argument, particularly through clear topic sentences expressing an historical idea
- included an explicit evaluative paragraph prioritising long-term consequences over short-term consequences
- included unnecessary detail that did not always strengthen the argument.

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

- selected specific events that allowed complex analysis
- demonstrated strong contextual knowledge
- applied their detailed understanding flexibly to the exact question asked
- made a sustained, coherent argument from introduction to conclusion
- wove evaluation throughout the essay rather than confining it to one section
- acknowledged complexity, limitations, and perspectives
- explained not just *what* happened, but why the evidence mattered for their argument
- used high-quality, specific, and appropriate evidence
- wrote concisely while demonstrating insight
- chose well-selected, direct consequences and explained them in depth.

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

- wrote cause-focused essays, or causes overshadowed consequences, or provided one cause and one consequence instead of two consequences
- chose vague or over-broad events
- selected contexts that did not permit two valid consequences

- wrote narratively or descriptively rather than analytically
- did not provide enough detail and relied on very generalised information
- provided insufficient or incorrect evidence
- discussed events that could be short-term or long-term consequences but did not causally link them to the event
- did not address the relative importance of the long-term consequences versus short-term consequences
- produced short or rushed responses with unclear argumentation.

---

## **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 two forces that influenced a significant historical trend, and to evaluate which force was more important and why.

### **Commentary**

Overall, historical trend selection remained important for this standard. Candidates who chose an appropriate trend generally experienced success. Trends centred on single events or individuals remained unsuitable for this standard.

### **Grade awarding**

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- used historic conventions
- used correct supporting evidence in support of their argument
- identified two forces accurately
- attempted to explain the impact of the forces on the trend
- attempted to use historiography
- addressed all parts of the question.

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

- used historic conventions
- used carefully curated historical evidence in support of their argument
- used historiography appropriately
- prioritised the forces
- addressed all parts of the question.

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

- wrote fluently using historic conventions
- curated supporting evidence to enhance their argument
- selected relevant historiography effectively
- addressed all parts of the question
- understood the intricacies of the forces on the trend.

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

- wrote short answers that lacked the depth required at Level 3
- provided an overview of their topic without supporting detail
- showed little understanding of the force or the trend
- wrote a narrative of events
- did not address all parts of the question.