

Assessment Report

On this page

[91436: Analyse evidence relating to an historical event of significance to New Zealanders](#) ▼

[91438: Analyse the causes and consequences of a significant historical event](#) ▼

[91439: Analyse a significant historical trend and the force\(s\) that influenced it](#) ▼

Level 3 History 2018

Standards [91436](#) [91438](#) [91439](#)

Part A: Commentary

Candidates engaged well with the three papers offered in 2018, despite hesitations about the changes signalled for the 91438 examination. Overall, candidates' responses more closely reflect the standard's requirement of "analysis". Across the three standards, candidates critically engaged with historical ideas and wrote structured and carefully considered responses.

It was pleasing to note that a greater number of candidates provided concise and succinct responses to the questions than in previous years.

There is to some extent still an issue with rote-learned and pre-prepared responses that are too similar to other candidates from that school. In other instances, candidates have prepared an essay response to the previous year's examination, and this excludes them from achieving higher grades.

Part B: Report on standards

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

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- had good knowledge of both causes and consequences, although coverage was not evenly balanced, often with a greater focus on causation
- had minimal analysis and tended to lapse into narrative
did not address the quote, did not understand the quote or used the quote in a nonsensical manner.

Candidates whose work was assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- did not complete all three questions
- did not understand historical concepts or could not apply the concepts to the sources and evidence
- interpreted the questions incorrectly and therefore gave incorrect or irrelevant responses
- interpreted the sources incorrectly
- quoted extensively from the sources in their responses, often with the exclusion of any original analysis.

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

- understood historical concepts and could analyse the sources and evidence thoroughly across the paper
- used multiple pieces of evidence from the sources to support generalisations about historical concepts
- wrote well-constructed responses that moved beyond simple narratives.

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

- wrote insightful responses that used various analytical methods such as categorisation, comparison, personal backgrounds and / or motivations of writers to interpret the sources
- interpreted the sources in ways that showed a deep understanding of the sources and their possible relationships with each other
- used succinct, specific evidence to support the generalisations made.

Standard specific comments

Candidates generally responded well to this examination. Candidates were engaged with the topic, which they appeared to have found interesting and generally wrote full responses for. Top candidates were able to use a full range of historical skills to interpret the sources.

91438: Analyse the causes and consequences of a significant historical event

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- had good knowledge of both causes and consequences, although coverage was not evenly balanced, often with a greater focus on causation
- had minimal analysis and tended to lapse into narrative
- did not address the quote, did not understand the quote or used the quote in a nonsensical manner.

Candidates whose work was assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- lacked planning
- made no attempt to answer the question

- did not link causation to the event
- wrote one consequence only
- wrote broad generalisations that were not supported by specific evidence
- wrote significant factual inaccuracies
- wrote a narrative or descriptive account
- did not choose a significant historical event.

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

- planned their response well, using the planning page boxes
- understood the question, tailored their response to the 2018 question, and took a clear position on the quote
- wrote strong and fairly balanced responses
- established clearly how causes contributed to the event
- demonstrated solid understanding of their topic but did not discuss causation and/or consequences with insight
- may not have chosen direct consequences
- used strong supporting evidence that supported key arguments.

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

- had a clear understanding of the quote, structured the outline of an argument within the introduction, and successfully returned to this throughout their writing to sustain and control their argument
- wrote well-thought-out analyses of key causes, successfully arguing why they had chosen to prioritise some particular causal factors over others
- identified direct consequences and successfully argued why the consequences were important in relation to the extent of the effect and /or the long term or continuing impact
- incorporated well-chosen, accurate, specific supporting evidence and avoided detail or evidence that did not advance their argument (thus writing concise responses)
- had a strong personal voice and gave good insight when discussing the question, eg, stated how historical perspectives change over time and how

some causes that seemed trivial can gain importance later or vice versa, or that causes that were personal, emotional, or vague could be seen as trivial

- incorporated historiography judiciously and in a manner that helped to advance their own personal argument.

Standard specific comments

The new format of a question with the quote produced a number of well-written scripts that encouraged candidates to move beyond a rote-learned essay and engage with the question and their event more critically. Despite apprehension around the changes to this assessment, the quality of writing from the candidates and the move away from rote-learned responses has seen an overall improvement in the responses received.

Candidates must choose a specific and historically significant event. Some events chosen were very broad, and whilst significant, it is hard for candidates to meet the requirements of a concise essay with broad events, while other chosen events did not have historical causes for candidates to analyse.

Candidates who wrote many causes and consequences were not at an advantage over those who wrote TWO causes and TWO consequences. Generally, concise scripts were of a better quality than those that were not.

Candidates should avoid using historiography as a replacement for their own argument.

Many students wrote a response that mirrored the wording of the exemplar question on the NZQA website or wrote a response that answered the NZHTA examination.

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

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- identified at least one significant force and explained it with supporting evidence
- identified at least two changes/continuities resulting from the historical trend

- changes and continuities were implied rather than explicitly stated
- confused what a historical force is, e.g. used a minor historical event as a force
- wrote an unbalanced essay with more focus on the forces aspect of the question
- gave limited detail when analysing changes/continuities and relied on generalisations instead.
- linked the historical trend to a historical force weakly linked the force to historical trend
- wrote a narrative account of the force/trend and the impact of the changes/continuities, rather than sufficiently analysing these.

Candidates whose work was assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- wrote a narrative of events on the trend
- addressed only one change/continuity
- lacked evidence to support the analysis of the forces and/or trend
- did not sufficiently relate evidence of continuity/change to the force or trend
- did not describe a force
- wrote about important or key people rather than a force
- described an event, rather than a trend
- used a trend that was extended over a prolonged period of time.

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

- identified at least two different forces and explained them using detailed supporting evidence
- analysed the forces and established their link and influence on the trend
- analysed the changes/continuities using detailed supporting evidence
- identified the changes and continuities and analysed either, or their positive/negative impact
- identified the impact on different groups and/or at different times
- ranked or prioritised the forces or changes and short-/long-term impacts

- used historians' perspectives to support their argument
- focused equally on forces and changes/continuities
- understood clearly how the trend and force worked together and created change
- focused on the trend, rather than a narrative of events.

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

- identified at least two different forces and explained these with comprehensive and insightful evidence
- wrote in a sustained and succinct manner
- analysed the complex relationship between the trend and forces and how this impacted on the changes/continuities within that trend
- convincingly explained the connections between the forces and changes in a clear and sustained way
- used relevant evidence to explain their perspective
- demonstrated sustained insight into the trend and forces
- were able to show the complexity of the relationship between the forces, the changes/continuities, and the historical trend
- analysed how the forces were advanced or slowed
- used a sustained and fluent writing style.

Standard specific comments

Trends addressed often had an overly extended timeline. This reduced the essay to a narrative of interconnected events, rather than an analysis of a trend.

Rote-learned essays did not always address the actual examination task.

Effective essays were planned, identifying the forces and then the way that they affected continuity/change.

Candidates who understood the historical relationship of 'change and continuity' and could integrate this understanding across their whole essay generally achieved at a higher level.

[History subject page](#)

Previous years' reports

[2017 \(PDF, 49KB\)](#) [2016 \(PDF, 218KB\)](#)

Copyright © New Zealand Qualifications Authority