

Assessment Report

On this page

[Level 1 Geography 2020](#) ▾

Level 1 Geography 2020

Standards [91007](#) [91008](#) [91010](#)

Part A: Commentary

A significant change to the examination was implemented in 2020 with all three standards moving to a single item paper. The rationale for this was to align the papers to the Level 2 and Level 3 Geography standards and address the concerns raised in previous years relating to time issues for candidates completing all three papers.

It was pleasing to see that students adjusted well to these changes and achievement rates improved.

Those candidates who explicitly referred to geographic concepts and unpacked them by integrating these concepts using appropriate geographic terminology achieved higher grades.

Candidates who integrated specific information, either through their case studies, or by using the provided resources, showed deeper understanding and achieved well.

To allow candidates to show depth of understanding, the questions required candidates to discuss only one factor.

Part B: Report on standards

91007: Demonstrate geographic understanding of environments that have been shaped by extreme natural event(s)

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- provided descriptive responses
- provided supporting sketches or maps with relevant labels
- understood the difference between effect and vulnerability
- supported responses with case study evidence that was relevant but basic.

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

- did not use relevant case study evidence
- misinterpreted questions and / or confused effects with vulnerability
- tried to apply rote-learned answers to the specific questions
- attempted only parts of the paper.

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

- supported their answers with case study evidence that was relevant and detailed
- provided responses that were well explained, with detailed annotated diagrams
- often did not show insight and / or present enough detail when discussing the effects of natural events

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

- integrated case study evidence consistently throughout their response
- provided clear diagrams or maps with clear explained annotations
- showed insight by linking the effects of the event to the future as an ongoing process

- applied subject-specific terminology and relevant concepts consistently throughout their responses.

Standard-specific comments

Candidates who understood the difference between an effect, a characteristic that makes people more vulnerable, and how people respond to an extreme natural event answered the questions effectively.

In part (b), where candidates were asked to refer to an effect, some candidates discussed either vulnerability (pre-event factors that made it worse) or responses to an effect (student army, aid given etc.) and did not respond to the question being asked.

Candidates are encouraged to include well-annotated diagrams and maps to obtain higher grades.

Care needs to be taken when selecting case studies for this standard as some localised case study settings made it difficult for candidates to fully explain their responses in detail. For example, Whakaari for natural effects.

Candidates who focussed on ONE extreme natural event case study tended to obtain higher grades. Those who gave three case study examples (e.g. cyclone Percy, typhoon Haiyan and hurricane Katrina) often confused the case studies and presented information that was incorrect.

A number of candidates discussed the actions that produce an extreme natural event but did not make connections / links between these actions to fully explain a process.

Candidates are expected to refer to a specific case study of an extreme natural event rather than give details about the environment in which it occurred.

91008: Demonstrate geographic understanding of population concepts

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- provided descriptive responses
- supported their responses with case study evidence that was relevant but basic.

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

- misinterpreted the questions
- did not use specific case study evidence
- identified aspects of a population but did not describe or explain these

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

- provided well-explained responses
- contained enough detail of population concepts to enable in-depth responses
- supported responses with case study evidence that was relevant and detailed
- included diagrams or maps that supported their responses.

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

- integrated detailed case study evidence throughout their response
- applied population concepts throughout their responses, showing insight
- provided clear diagrams or maps with explained annotations
- used subject-specific terminology consistently throughout their responses, reflecting knowledge of the wider subject.

Standard-specific comments

Candidates who provided relevant case study evidence material and included clearly annotated diagrams or maps tended to score higher grades.

91010: Apply concepts and basic geographic skills to demonstrate understanding of a given environment

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- used a range of basic skills to interpret the given environment and the topographic map
- used some basic conventions to complete a map or diagram
- showed a basic understanding of geographic concepts without supporting them with explanations.

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

- used a limited range of skills
- did not include mapping and diagram conventions such as titles, north arrow, keys, scale
- lacked understanding of how to apply geographic concepts to the given environment
- presented the resource information that was provided without applying them to the question.

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

- used a range of geographic skills with precision to interpret the given environment
- used relevant geographic conventions with precision, for example, titles, north arrow, keys, scale
- showed in-depth understanding by supporting their responses with specific examples
- explicitly applied relevant geographic concepts to the selected environment.

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

- used a range of geographic skills with consistent precision to interpret the given environment
- used relevant geographic conventions with consistent precision, for example, titles, north arrow, keys, scale
- showed a high level of understanding of the geographic concepts by unpacking the concepts and using their key words to integrate in their responses
- made clear links between the concepts and relevant information from the resource booklet.

Standard-specific comments

Candidates are encouraged to use a variety of skills, conventions, and concepts to accurately interpret the given environment. This includes techniques that allow

them to use precision when using conventions to complete précis maps, diagrams, etc.

Those candidates who identified key ideas from the resource, and then used appropriate geographic concepts, provided responses that more effectively showed understanding. Use of a range of specific information from the resources to support responses is encouraged.

[Geography subject page](#)

Previous years' reports

[2019 \(PDF, 243KB\)](#)

[2018 \(PDF, 121KB\)](#)

[2017 \(PDF, 46KB\)](#)

[2016 \(PDF, 217KB\)](#)