

National Certificate of Educational Achievement

2012 Assessment Report

History Level 1

- 91003 Interpret sources of an historical event of significance to New Zealanders**
- 91005 Describe the causes and consequences of an historical event**
- 91006 Describe how a significant historical event affected New Zealand society**

COMMENTARY

The overall calibre of candidate responses in this examination was high. Many candidates came into their examination well-prepared and able to write with breadth and depth in the standards they attempted. Grade Score Marking was used in all three external standards, and both AS91003 and AS91006 were marked as three separate questions. This meant that students who faltered in one question still had the possibility of registering a total sufficient for Achieved or Merit, as it was the total score that counted in the end. Many students who got Merit and Excellence level scores in two questions compiled a total score that allowed them to pass even if they left a question blank or got a low score. All markers on the panel felt that this approach was a lot fairer to students than the previous system.

There are some instances where changes are necessary in the understanding and use of skills for all standards.

STANDARD REPORTS

91003 Interpret sources of an historical event of significance to New Zealanders

Question One

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:

- understood the question, showed a basic understanding of the information and could use it to answer the question
- provided some description of **why** the Great depression had an impact on New Zealand society
- showed some understanding of **why** the Great depression had an impact on New Zealand society
- identified one valid reason e.g. dependence on Britain, or New Zealand's unpreparedness
- expressed the reason, attempting to use their own words in explanation (at least in part)
- used some evidence and examples from the sources to back up their statements - at times this was irrelevant
- did not link all the causes of the Great Depression together – talked about them in isolation. Often these points were extracted straight from the source but were connected to question in candidates' own words
- extracted and summarised material but did not fully explain it
- made valid points but failed to back up with evidence or explanation. This was often a feature of "bullet point" responses.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:

- did not cover enough information – may have identified only one reason why the depression affected NZ and not explained it
- provided very limited coverage and showed little evidence of having read both specified sources beyond the first two paragraphs. Copied material directly from the sources with no explanation or interpretation
- showed no or very limited understanding of the sources and often extracted predominantly irrelevant material from the sources
- failed to address the question at all: many explained how the depression affected New Zealand and not **why**
- either did not understand question or misinterpreted the question
- did not identify any connection from the information in the source to the question.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- linked some of the causes together
- understood the question and directly answered it
- understood the relationship and dependence New Zealand had on Britain
- explained **why** the Great Depression had an impact on New Zealand society
- showed a good understanding of why the Great depression had an impact on New Zealand society
- had a sound working knowledge of the concept of cause and effect they could use to frame their response
- processed the information into own words and providing relevant evidence
- linked ideas together to show a good level of understanding.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- integrated concepts like cause and effect, change and continuity accurately to add depth and clarity to their responses
- interpreted the sources in depth and used their interpretation to clearly explain why the great depression had an impact on New Zealand
- showed a sound and reasoned understanding of why the Great Depression had an impact on New Zealand society
- synthesised their ideas into a concise and fluent piece of writing which provided sophisticated explanations using relevant supporting detail
- selected relevant evidence from both the Introduction and Source A to provide a convincing and comprehensive explanation
- made specific reference to sources
- directly answered the question in their own words.

Question Two

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:

- selected some relevant evidence from the sources to show some understanding of the impact of the great depression on New Zealanders
- described the impact of the depression on groups accurately and summarised how groups were generally affected
- quoted directly from the sources
- extracted information with some explanation
- gave answers without much detail or depth
- included some good examples to back up ideas
- extracted relevant information from some of the sources
- made some valid points but failed to consistently back them up with evidence or explanation
- only covered one group well and the other weakly or not at all.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:

- copied responses straight from the resources with no interpretation
- failed to clearly identify groups or may have talked about the wrong groups entirely or did not identify an appropriate group at all e.g. household economies
- showed limited ability to interpret material
- extracted irrelevant material from the sources
- wrote very brief responses which did not explain why groups were affected
- used direct quotes, frequently of some length, with no explanation
- chose groups for whom there was very little evidence, or combined groups that were too diverse to allow meaningful explanation
- answered only one group and not well
- did not understand what was required
- could not connect information from the source to the question.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- clearly identified the groups and often started their answers by stating how they were affected
- provided sound explanations by using own words to link material from the sources
- showed a good understanding of the impact of the Great Depression on two groups of New Zealanders
- accurately showed an understanding of how two groups were affected
- selected groups that were easy to talk about, showing a sound reading of the sources eg discussed Māori discrimination and hardships on women

- gave sufficient supporting evidence linked to the points they made eg quotes, facts with explanatory comments, etc
- used more than one source and clearly linked this evidence to their ideas
- showed a thorough and in depth understanding and interpreted the source material accurately
- used a wider range of sources to gather more than the average amount of information and thereby showed an in depth analysis.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- showed initiative in their answer which sometimes extended to suggesting historically valid ways that a group was impacted that was not outlined in the resources
- compared and contrasted the group they were writing about with others
- explained how they were impacted with evidence to back up generalisations
- covered both groups comprehensively and made specific references to the sources
- showed a perceptive understanding of how two groups were affected and portrayed this in a concise manner
- provided detail in their answers
- synthesised information from different sources to back up more important points and gave specific information to prove these points
- used multiple sources
- tied their information and ideas together and turned the question into a well-informed discussion
- expressed a critical judgement that showed thought about consequences of depression conditions
- showed real analysis and wrote in depth, providing evidence they were developing their historian's perception to draw reasonable inferences from historical sources
- wrote with clarity, fluidity and economy
- made summative statements covering the overall effect on their groups in their own words.

Question Three

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:

- did not link their response to the idea of "significance to New Zealanders" with any confidence or insight
- worked with a limited notion of "significance" that conflated it with "importance"
- listed the statements from the top box and described them briefly
- had valid conclusions and described them but then used evidence from the resources that might not link with the conclusion very well
- made one or two conclusions which showed some understanding about why the Great Depression was significant to New Zealanders
- provided limited explanation and mainly extracted material from sources

- had a previously planned approach to the question, which led them to try to answer last year's question on how to check reliability but managed to include some relevant material about significance/conclusions/generalisations
- mentioned significance in a relevant context but left this undeveloped
- extracted some relevant information from the sources to provide conclusions
- tended to stumble upon conclusions rather than have them well formed in their answers.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:

- gave generalisations but then just listed statements copied straight from the resources
- gave a generalisation or conclusion that showed no significance to New Zealanders e.g. Wall St crashing or the whole world being affected
- failed to attempt this question
- had no working concept of significance to guide their response (and did not recognise the cues provided by the question)
- did not understand the intent of the question and made no links to the idea of significance
- copied material from the sources without drawing any conclusions
- lacked supporting evidence
- did not understand what a conclusion/generalisation is in a historical context
- extracted material but gave no explanation
- did not read the question and treated this as a reliability and usefulness question
- described rather than gave explanations
- gave factual information from sources but did not relate this information to a conclusion or general statement.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- had valid conclusions and then used evidence from the resources that link up well
- made a clear link or links to why it was significant to New Zealanders. Sometimes the links were implicit
- selected a number of pieces of relevant supporting evidence
- showed a good understanding of the material by using own words
- demonstrated an ability to think critically about the evidence
- had a working but sometimes undeveloped sense of the concept of significance
- clearly indicated where one conclusion finished and the next one started
- included relevant supporting detail and referred to sources
- mostly used their own words and used most available sources
- were prepared for a reliability of evidence question but managed to include relevant material about significance/conclusions/generalisations which was mixed in with some irrelevant material
- used the significance bullet points as a starting point for conclusions.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- came up with their own conclusions and then used the list from the box above to explain how it was significant to New Zealanders
- integrated historical ideas like change and continuity
- made two valid conclusions with detailed explanations about why the Great Depression was significant to New Zealanders
- selected a range of relevant supporting evidence from the sources and showed excellent understanding of this material
- wrote lucidly and confidently
- understood clearly the idea of significance
- linked their conclusions to the evidence and clearly explained why their conclusions were significant to New Zealanders
- showed superior understanding of the text by picking two very good conclusions eg racism, gender discrimination etc
- realised that the depression led to significant changes in NZ society and politics – some linked ideas to how NZ has dealt with today's recession and how it is different and why
- synthesised material in a discussion and integrated source information fluently in their essay
- understood the exact requirements of the question
- were able to see a broader/larger picture about the Great Depression rather than focusing on one group or source at a time.

OTHER COMMENTS

AS91003 proved challenging for many candidates as there were significant changes from the previous year's examinations. It is important that teachers read the Achievement Standard carefully and are aware that any of the skills referred to under explanatory note 4 could be covered in the examination. There were a number of very good candidates who did not achieve to their potential as it appeared that they had been prepped to answer Question Three only as a reliability and usefulness question. Other skills that could be touched upon include – the interpretation of an historical idea or ideas, facts, perspectives, reliability, bias and limitations of the evidence etc.

There were also many candidates who wrote on extra paper instead of using the blank pages at the back of the book. The panel would like to encourage using the additional pages provided in the booklet and use these up before asking for extra paper and plastic bags.

91005 Describe the causes and consequences of an historical event

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:

- described with some supporting evidence one cause and one consequence of an event. The causes and consequences had to be relevant and not simply occurrences before and after the historical event
- described historical events that were difficult to expand on in detail in a meaningful way (ie crime history (Parker-Hulme murder), environmental events (The Napier Earthquake). Candidates could and did reach the higher levels with these. However, it is much harder to establish historical context with such events and students were disadvantaged by several such event choices.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:

- chose an inappropriate event
- were unable to define a clear event
- did not include a valid and relevant description of a cause and/or consequence.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- described in detail one or two causes and consequences of an event
- choose an event with historical substance and clear context
- used appropriate supporting evidence
- linked the causes and consequences to the event and did not simply write everything that came before and after.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- described comprehensively two or three causes and consequences of an event
- choose an event with historical substance and clear context
- used comprehensive and relevant supporting evidence
- linked the causes and consequences to the event and did not simply write everything that came before and after.

OTHER COMMENTS

Candidates should be able to write an essay with comprehensive detail and supporting evidence on their chosen historical event. Many candidates chose 'popular' history without placing it in historical context. These events can be relevant and valid when used in such context. However, many candidates did not do this. (Examples of this include: The sinking of the Titanic, the assassination of JFK, the Parker-Hulme murders, the Aramoana massacre, the Napier earthquake and the Tangiwai rail tragedy). Candidates did not gain high grades using these topics this way.

Candidates must also show causality and they must place their topic into historical context and clearly link causes and consequences to the event. Just because an event occurred before or after the main focus does not make it a cause or a consequence. This relationship must be established by the candidate and not assumed.

91006 Describe how a significant historical event affected New Zealand society

Question One

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:

- briefly described their chosen event
- supported their description with limited relevant evidence, and which may have been inaccurate
- focused on the background to the event rather than describing their chosen event

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:

- identified an event with limited or inaccurate description of the event
- describe an event not of significance to New Zealanders
- attempted to describe an event but lacked detail or evidence to support description
- described a movement rather than a significant event
- used little if any specific evidence to support description. This was often inaccurate or incorrect.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- accurately described chosen event in some depth
- used appropriate, relevant and accurate evidence to support description
- gave appropriate coverage of chosen event.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- described their chosen event thoroughly and appropriately covered the scope of their chosen event.
- supported this with accurate and relevant evidence throughout.
- provided relevant organisation of their chosen event.

Question Two

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:

- identified two people and or groups and described how one of the groups were affected by their chosen event

- supported description with limited supporting evidence. This may have been generic/ broad or inaccurate
- referred to irrelevant groups/people.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:

- identified groups/people with little or no description
- gave limited supporting evidence. This may have been irrelevant or inaccurate
- gave description that did not link with how the groups/people were affected -rather actions the groups/people took during the chosen event.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- identified and described how two groups/people were affected as a result of the chosen historical event
- supported the descriptions with accurate and relevant supporting evidence that linked to how the groups were affected by their chosen historical event.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- identified and described two groups/ people
- supported each groups/ people with a range of accurate and relevant historical evidence
- often used evidence that had not been mentioned in Question One.

Question Three

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:

- gave a basic description of how their chosen event was of significance to New Zealand society
- wrote description that often did not extend much past the chosen event, or gave responses that were generic – eg “It’s significant because we learnt about it in school”
- provided little or no new supporting evidence that had not already been mentioned in either Question One or Question Two
- wrote on only one of the suggested bullet points.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:

- made no link between event and how it was significant to New Zealand and New Zealanders
- identified significance only with little or no supporting evidence
- restated the information from Question One and Question Two making no links to how this event was of significance to New Zealand and New Zealanders.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- showed understanding of key historical ideas and linked these ideas with their chosen historical event in a meaningful way
- used relevant supporting evidence that was not merely repeated from Question One and Question Two
- linked the event to a wider historical context in a meaningful way.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- demonstrated a solid conceptual understanding of how their chosen historical event was and in some cases still is of significance to New Zealand and New Zealanders
- gave balanced responses covering most of the bullet points suggested
- used relevant and accurate supporting evidence that was not a repeat of Question One and Two
- demonstrated knowledge of the event in a wider time frame.

OTHER COMMENTS

Many candidates had basic understanding of what the questions were asking of them. Due to the subtitle change in question two it was obvious that many candidates did not read the question before writing responses. It is important that the event chosen by the candidate is appropriate for answering all three parts of the paper. Some events tend to be more difficult to look at in the context of their significance to New Zealand.

The scale and time of a chosen event does impact on the different questions. While the 1981 Springbok tour was a popular choice, candidates needed to ensure that when describing the event they talked about the specifics of the tour and what happened.

It was also important for Question Three that candidates linked the event to a wider historical framework. Many responses for this question were limited, and did not extend beyond stating the dates of the chosen topic.

A wide range of topics were chosen, and the two most popular responses were the Bombing of the Rainbow Warrior and the 1981 Springbok Tour.