

2025 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 included relevant historical evidence to support responses.

Achievement was strongly influenced by candidates' depth of understanding, their choice of historical context, and ability to interpret evidence rather than write narrative accounts. Selection of the historical context remains very important for both standards and is discussed in more detail in the standard-specific reports. Candidates should use contexts where individuals/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

The examination required candidates to respond to a question consisting of three parts. The context provided in the resource booklet was Tūrangawaewae Marae, Waikato. Candidates were required to demonstrate an understanding of two specified historical concepts (tūrangawaewae and effect) in the context of the resource material provided. Candidates were also required to demonstrate an understanding of one of those historical concepts in a studied historical context of significance to Aotearoa New Zealand.

Commentary

Overall, the examination was accessible and allowed candidates to engage with the historical concepts of tūrangawaewae and effect across both prescribed and self-selected contexts. Most candidates attempted all parts of the examination. However, the candidates' depth of conceptual understanding, choice of historical context, and ability to interpret evidence rather than write narrative accounts strongly influenced their ability to achieve.

A significant and recurring issue was candidates' reliance on the literal translation of tūrangawaewae as "a place to stand", without connecting this to broader terms, such as *rights of belonging*, *residence*, *identity*, and *authority through kinship and whakapapa*. These connections were particularly common in protest-based contexts, including the 1981 Springbok Tour, the 1963 Birmingham Campaign, and the 1975 Land March, where tūrangawaewae was often treated metaphorically rather than as a place-based and relational concept.

The 1975 Land March, while historically popular and successful, proved challenging when paired with tūrangawaewae. Many candidates focused on narrating the events of the 1975 Land March rather than explaining how tūrangawaewae was expressed, challenged, or affirmed through Māori relationships with whenua and identity. The historical concept of effect would have been more suited to this context.

Part (c) of the question proved the most challenging, as candidates frequently struggled when they selected contexts that did not lend themselves naturally to the required concepts, particularly tūrangawaewae. The use of contexts, such as the Mount Erebus disaster and Kemp's Deed, made it difficult for candidates to establish meaningful conceptual links. Disaster-based contexts were especially limited when used with the historical concept of tūrangawaewae. Similarly, the 1970s Dawn Raids and the actions of the Polynesian Panthers often proved ineffective contexts when used with the historical concept of tūrangawaewae, not lending themselves to responses with sufficient conceptual depth.

There was also some confusion between the historical concept of tūrangawaewae and the building of Tūrangawaewae Marae as an event, leading to conceptual inaccuracies. For clarity, the historical event chosen should not be the same as the historical concept being examined.

The examination successfully differentiated between levels of candidate understanding, with higher level responses characterised by strong concept-first thinking, appropriate context selection, clear structure, and analytical use of evidence.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- answered all three parts
- described the concepts and identified where they appeared in the context, but explanation of the concepts was limited
- relied heavily on direct quotations or paraphrasing of the sources, followed by brief descriptive statements
- used generic or limited evidence, particularly in part (c)
- interpreted tūrangawaewae simply as belonging, or a significant place, without addressing whakapapa, mana, or rights to land.

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

- explained both tūrangawaewae and effect in relation to the resource material and their own studied context
- linked the evidence to the concepts, using a range of evidence to explain how the evidence demonstrated the concept
- interpreted Source D correctly, distinguishing between the concept of tūrangawaewae and Tūrangawaewae Marae
- demonstrated a clear understanding of the how and why of the concepts
- showed greater depth by considering aspects, such as short-term and long-term effects.

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

- demonstrated a thorough, nuanced understanding of the concepts across all three parts
- selected only the most relevant evidence, rather than summarising entire sources to fully develop the explanation
- explained explicitly how and why their chosen historical context reflected the concepts (e.g. "This relates to tūrangawaewae because ...")
- constructed arguments first and supported them with evidence

- applied tūrangawaewae with sophistication, considering elements such as whakapapa, mana, identity, and reciprocal relationships between people and land
- performed consistently well across all parts of the question, showing planning, logical structure, and minimal repetition
- made insightful connections between the concepts and their chosen historical context, demonstrating a strong grasp of broader historical ideas.

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

- did not attempt all three parts, particularly part (c)
- selected inappropriate concepts for their chosen context, particularly in part (c)
- demonstrated an inaccurate understanding of tūrangawaewae
- wrote narrative accounts with little or no reference to the concepts
- used limited, inaccurate, or no evidence to support their responses
- misinterpreted key sources, particularly Source D
- selected historical contexts that did not align well with the concepts, such as natural disaster events (e.g. the Mount Erebus disaster) when examining tūrangawaewae.

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

Assessment

The examination required candidates to respond to a question with four parts. Candidates were required to demonstrate an understanding of two differing perspectives, using one historical context of their choice. The historical context could be a historical person, place, or event. Responses considered the beliefs, motivations, and experiences that shaped the perspectives on the candidates' chosen historical context. Candidates were also required to address perspectives from both the immediate and wider historical context, including the use of relevant historical evidence.

Commentary

Overall, the choice of a specific historical context remains integral to the perspectives which are then described. At times, candidates are selecting perspectives which may not accurately align with the context, or vice versa. Perspectives could be opposing or aligned, but they must be distinct.

Candidates would benefit from prioritising the "why" (motivations and beliefs) over a simple "what" (chronological narrative) in reference to the actions and/or responses.

Some candidates placed the context at the forefront of their responses, which tended to unfold into a more narrative description of events in a chronological fashion, limiting their response. Candidates should instead focus on how the beliefs, motivations, experiences, and perspectives of two individuals or groups shape their actions and responses in a historical context. This would then provide the opportunity for candidates to explore the diverse factors that may shape a group or individual's perspective on a historical context, and how this perspective may in turn shape the historical narrative.

The choice of the historical context used is important. For example, a context could be "the 1957 desegregation of Little Rock Central High School" rather than "Little Rock High". Another example could be "the 1945 atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki" rather than "the Japanese bombings".

Some of the popular contexts chosen for this standard included:

- Māori conscription in World War I
- the 1957 desegregation of Little Rock Central High School
- the 1981 Springbok Tour
- the 1955–1956 Montgomery Bus Boycott
- the 1945 atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki
- the 1970s Dawn Raids.

When discussing the action(s) taken, candidates would benefit from covering more than one action, and from covering specific actions. This would allow greater unpacking, and a more detailed explanation for the responses taken by individuals/groups.

Candidates needed to explain how and/or why the perspectives differed, not simply state that they were different, to gain a grade of Merit or higher. Candidates who discussed the how or why were generally better able to discuss the wider context in detail and link to the individual or group's actions or responses.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- described the perspectives of two individuals or groups, in relation to an appropriate historical context
- described the actions and/or responses of two individuals or groups, in relation to an appropriate historical context
- included relevant historical evidence in the description.

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

- explained the perspectives of two individuals or groups, in relation to an appropriate historical context
- explained the actions and/or responses of two individuals or groups, in relation to an appropriate historical context
- explained the differences between the perspectives and actions
- used relevant historical evidence to support the explanation.

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

- discussed the perspectives of two individuals or groups, in relation to an appropriate historical context
- discussed the actions and / or responses of two individuals or groups, in relation to an appropriate historical context
- discussed the differences between the perspectives and actions of the different individuals or groups, including how or why they are different
- incorporated the wider historical context into the discussion, such as deeper motives, or included reference to other events, past or present, that might be important to the shaping of perspectives or motivating actions
- used relevant evidence to develop the explanation.

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

- identified only one perspective or unbalanced perspectives
- based their response on something other than perspectives
- wrote a historical narrative rather than describing perspectives and responses
- included very limited or inaccurate historical evidence to support their ideas.