

National Certificate of Educational Achievement

2009 Assessment Report

History Level 3

- 90656 Analyse and evaluate evidence in historical sources**
- 90657 Examine a significant decision made by people in history, in an essay**
- 90658 Examine a significant historical situation in the context of change, in an essay**

COMMENTARY

Candidates should have been familiar with the requirements of the achievement standard and the terminology used, and considered carefully the wording of questions before starting their responses. Candidates should have read widely around their chosen area of study.

Many candidates made superficial generalisations unsupported by evidence or examples, thereby demonstrating little connection with the question, and some provided extensive factual material that was not related to a specific question.

In the two essay papers, the better grades were awarded to candidates who wrote a concise introduction, and developed an argument with clear use of supporting evidence.

STANDARD REPORTS

90656 Analyse and evaluate evidence in historical sources

ACHIEVEMENT

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

- correctly responded to both question and resource
- identified and recorded information relevant to the question from the resources as supporting evidence in their answer
- identified the key idea or point of view of the source material and focused their answer on that key idea or point of view
- identified the historical relationships of *cause and effect*, or *past and present* and addressed both aspects of the relationship in their analysis
- made a genuine and valid judgement about the usefulness and/or reliability of the source material provided
- analysed the source at a basic level, even if they were not able to put the source into an historical context.

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 commonly:

- did not answer the question directly, (e.g. some candidates described the content of the source or quoted long passages, but they did not link the source detail to the question)
- did not use information from the resource to support their ideas, e.g. made generalisations, but did not refer to the resource in any meaningful way or give any contextual information about the resource
- did not address both parts of the historical relationship questions
- made invalid judgements or provided generalised, prepared responses without making reference to specific evidence from the resources themselves
- did not answer a question from each of the three sections of the paper.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

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

- wrote in a structured, reasoned, and analytical manner, providing a generalisation supported by evidence or examples
- showed some understanding of the wider historical context of the resource material
- correctly used key terms (e.g. cause and effect, past and present, usefulness, reliability etc.)
- explained and analysed resource material in some depth
- provided sound judgement and reasoning as to the usefulness and/or reliability of the source material provided
- demonstrated familiarity and transfer of historical skills in their answers.

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 commonly:

- structured their responses and covered what was asked, both utilising the resources provided and integrating their own wider knowledge
- provided lucid and perceptive answers that demonstrated depth of analysis/evaluation and explanation of context
- integrated their own knowledge effectively into their answer, and displayed a detailed understanding of the wider historical context of the resource
- demonstrated sophisticated understanding of what the resource showed an historian, how an historian might use the resource, and what additional information an historian might need to find out
- made reference to the ideas and views of well known historians supporting their argument where appropriate.

OTHER COMMENTS

Some candidates seemed unaware of the expectations for AS 90656, such as the need to be able to make judgements around the usefulness and/or reliability of evidence. Prepared generalisations were insufficient for the award of Achievement when not backed up with reference to specific examples in the resource. Candidates who demonstrated their own knowledge of the historical context surrounding the incident/person/time period under discussion were generally awarded Achievement with Merit or Achievement with Excellence.

90657 Examine a significant decision made by people in history, in an essay

ACHIEVEMENT

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

- covered both parts of the question, even though, for some, coverage was not equally balanced across both question parts
- structured their essay to include an introduction, a series of linked paragraphs and a conclusion
- supported general ideas with some relevant examples / evidence
- wrote in a mainly narrative or descriptive style with some evidence of analysis or evaluation

- demonstrated a basic knowledge of the factors and consequences of the selected issues/ events/ decisions
- described in outline, key factors and consequences.

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 commonly:

- did not plan their essay to ensure that both parts of the question were covered
- did not structure their essay
- did not link their response to the question
- made short general statements that did not relate to the specific question or had little supporting evidence
- wrote large sections that were vague, irrelevant or highly repetitive
- did not demonstrate any understanding of features, events, and personalities that could be used towards explaining the factors in the decision and its consequences
- used a prepared essay without adapting their knowledge to fit the question
- did not conform to the date parameters of 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 commonly:

- made a sustained, well supported and logically developed argument using an essay format
- provided a reasonably balanced coverage and developed links to both parts of the question
- used detailed or comprehensive examples / evidence reflecting familiarity with a greater range of factors in the decision and its consequences
- partially explained and evaluated factors in the decision, and the consequences.

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 commonly:

- were well organised, with a very detailed planning page
- had a fluent and articulate writing style that accurately explained and evaluated the factors in the decision and the consequences
- wrote a clear argument supported by a convincing amount and depth of detail that directly answered the question
- wrote answers that were perceptive and/or comprehensive in scope, many demonstrating evidence of wide reading and understanding of contemporary historical interpretation.

90658 Examine a significant historical situation in the context of change, in an essay

ACHIEVEMENT

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

- covered both parts of the question, even those who addressed one part of the question very well and provided only brief coverage of the other part
- structured their essay with a basic introduction, conclusion and paragraphing and wrote about 4–5 pages
- supported general ideas with some relevant examples / evidence
- wrote in a mainly narrative or descriptive style with some analysis or evaluation
- directed a basic knowledge of features, events, and personalities to describing a changing situation and its influence on people in the designated time period
- described in broad terms, the changing situation and its influence on 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 commonly:

- did not cover both parts of the question
- did not provide sufficient structure to their essay (introduction, linked paragraphs, conclusion)
- wrote a response that was insufficiently related to the question
- made short general statements not specifically related to the question, provided little supporting evidence
- wrote large sections that were vague, irrelevant or highly repetitive
- did not demonstrate any understanding of features, events, and personalities that could be used to describe the changing situation or its influence on people
- used a prepared essay without adapting their knowledge to fit the question
- did not conform to the date parameters of 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 commonly:

- developed and substantiated with relevant detail, an historical argument, responding directly to both parts of the question
- made a sustained, well supported and logically developed argument using an essay format
- used detailed or comprehensive examples / evidence reflecting familiarity with the changing situation and its influence on people.

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 commonly:

- had a fluent and articulate writing style
- accurately explained and evaluated a historical development and its influence upon people

- wrote a clear, focused and convincing argument supported by depth of detail
- demonstrated evidence of wide reading and understanding of contemporary historical interpretation.

OTHER COMMENTS

The best candidates provided specific, well substantiated responses to what was asked and made excellent use of the planning page to help structure the response.