

2015 NCEA Assessment Report

Geography Level 3 91426, 91427, 91429

Part A: Commentary

Candidates must read all questions carefully and tailor their responses to the questions being asked. Writing pre-prepared responses are less likely to be successful at this level as are answers that simply contain all that a candidate knows about a topic or environment. Candidates are unable to gain higher grades in this examination if they do not focus their answer on key command terms in the question. Knowing the difference between common examination terms such as evaluate, analyse and justify is essential.

Candidates who use planning spaces or who annotate the questions to unpack them are often successful as they have processed and considered the question. This often leads to responses that are focused, logical and detailed.

Part B: Report on standards

1. Assessment Report for 91426: Demonstrate understanding of how interacting natural processes shape a New Zealand geographic environment

Achieved	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> named a specific geographic environment explained in simple terms how processes operated within their environment did not make links between process operation and the features created Demonstrated understanding of how processes operate in conjunction with one another (interaction between processes) to create features in their geographic environment Wrote pre-prepared answers for spatial variation or temporal variation which showed limited relevance to the question.
Not Achieved	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> made no reference to a specific New Zealand geographic environment did not understand the term interacting processes but wrote about interacting elements treated each process independently without making any links between them did not explain the operation of processes within their environment wrote about many natural features in their environment and did not link their shape or creation to the operation of interacting processes wrote about how processes operated to shape an environment without identifying features did not attempt to answer the question asked and described the characteristics of their chosen environment.
Achieved with Merit	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> referred to a specific New Zealand geographic environment clearly understood the difference between an environment and a significant natural feature were able to include a visual diagram or map that was relevant to the question selected and added to the quality of the response explained how processes operated within their environment and linked their operation to a significant natural feature demonstrated a sound understanding of how processes worked in conjunction with one another did not treat processes independently partially incorporated the concept of processes operating at different rates or scales, some understanding of rates or scales was included.

<p>Achieved with Excellence</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • wrote clear and concise answers that were planned, showed logical progression and integrated relevant specific evidence from their New Zealand geographic environment • clearly understood the difference between an environment and a significant natural feature • typically only selected to write about one or two significant natural features which allowed their responses to contain sufficient depth of explanation and technical detail • were able to include a visual diagram or map that was relevant to the question selected and added to the quality of the response • comprehensively explained how processes operated within their environment by explaining the series of steps involved in each with technical detail and using geographic terminology • clearly linked the operation of processes to the shaping of a significant natural feature • demonstrated a sound understanding of how processes worked in conjunction with one another rather than treating each process independently • incorporated the concept of processes operating at different rates or scales throughout their response demonstrating a sound comprehension of rates or scales.
<p>Standard specific comments</p>	<p>Candidates need to be able to clearly identify key geographic terms included within the question. Candidates tended to gain higher grades if they clearly understood the difference between a geographic environment and a significant natural feature and linked their response to the shaping of the feature, rather than providing only a response on formation. Those that wrote about the whole environment (e.g. a whole river valley) found it difficult to score as did not accurately respond to the question.</p> <p>Inclusion of the phrase ‘operation of interacting natural processes’ within the question meant that candidates had to show evidence of analysis of process operation within their answer for Achievement. Candidates must be able explain processes (how they operate as a series of steps) and move beyond descriptive responses to gain achieved level.</p> <p>Candidates need to clearly understand the difference between elements and processes. Some candidates continue to write about interactions between elements or interactions between a process and a feature which does not meet the standard requirements. Processes discussed independently did not meet criteria for Achievement, neither did processes that were not linked to an agent (e.g erosion, transportation and deposition – must be linked to fluvial, Aeolian, wave)</p> <p>Pre-learnt answers (spatial variation particularly) were evident and did not help candidates achieve higher levels.</p>

2. Assessment Report for 91427: Demonstrate understanding of how a cultural process shapes geographic environment(s)

<p>Achieved</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • managed to demonstrate some understanding of the process but analysis was limited and/or candidates only described • provided a visual that did not provide any details and simply labelled places/features • demonstrated some understanding of how the cultural process operated and used some supporting case study evidence • described the changes over time but did not include how the elements, features, and/or characteristics had led to these variations • described how the operation of the cultural process impacted on people and the environment.
------------------------	--

<p>Not Achieved</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provided little supporting case study evidence about their chosen setting • used very limited geographic terminology and ideas/understanding • did not describe what the temporal variations were • did not describe what the impacts on people and/or the environment were • did not analyse the way the process operates • provided rote-learned responses • did not write enough content or explanation that was relevant to the question.
<p>Achieved with Merit</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • drew a diagram that identified temporal variations and included annotations to explain the variations • had both a detailed diagram/map and a detailed written answer. • included detailed supporting case study evidence • analysed in detail how the cultural process operated to cause these variations • used case studies that had enough breadth to provide opportunities to show their understanding • used specific dates, place names, businesses.
<p>Achieved with Excellence</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • were able to annotate the maps or diagrams with additional information or explanations • integrated comprehensive supporting case study evidence throughout the answer • comprehensively explained how the cultural process operated to create temporal variations • effectively incorporated case study material into responses • clearly understood how the cultural process operated and how this impacted on people and the environment • used a variety of examples and gave well-reasoned conclusions • showed insight by linking more than one idea, often encompassing geographical concepts.
<p>Standard specific comments</p>	<p>Candidates who performed well wrote clear and concise answers that provided specific case study evidence within the space provided. The lines given are an indication of the expected length of answer. Candidates should be aware that to gain excellence they need to demonstrate “comprehensive understanding” which means they must use geographic terminology and concepts, and show insight in their responses, as well as integrating detailed case study evidence throughout their responses. Some candidates wrote full and detailed answers but did not achieve higher grades because they gave a prepared answer that did not address the actual question. For example they wrote about impacts or positive and/or negative social and/or economic factors. Also many candidates wrote about allocentric or psychocentric tourism but not relate them to spatial or temporal patterns.</p> <p>Candidates who did not perform well tended to not draw a diagram/map, not answer the actual question, not write enough to answer the question and meet the standard or not include specific information related to the question.</p>

3. Assessment Report for 91429: Demonstrate understanding of a given environment(s) through selection and application of geographic concepts and skills

<p>Achieved</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrated some understanding of the concepts such as interaction • described rather than analysed or explained • interpreted resources correctly and could apply skills and knowledge • selected and constructed a graph with accurate conventions • provided examples of consequences and causes as per the questions • focused on one aspect rather than considering a range of <u>causes</u> or consequences • did not come to a conclusion.
------------------------	--

<p>Not Achieved</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • could not draw a graph with the correct conventions • did not understand the words in the questions, such as causes or consequences • did not have an understanding of geographic concepts • had little or no structure to their writing • transferred information directly from the resource booklet without interpreting it.
<p>Achieved with Merit</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • wrote detailed written answers throughout the paper that were logically structured • demonstrated sound geographic knowledge of the concepts and could apply this correctly • could select and construct an accurate and appropriate graph eg line graph • could explain how the concept of change is significant by explaining the consequences of water scarcity in Las Vegas • could identify and explain consequences of the graph from the resources provided • provided specific evidence from the resources in their explanations and analysis • could identify and provide appropriate detail from the resources provided • came to an overall conclusion for the cause of the water crisis • understood and followed the command words in each question.
<p>Achieved with Excellence</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • understood the key terms of fully explain, comprehensively analyse, consequences • interpreted and discussed a range of resources accurately • fully understood the need to provide specific and accurate information from multiple resources in their responses • selected appropriate graphing method and accurately constructed the graph • identified the key changes and categorised the consequences of water scarcity • showed insight by being able to apply, explain and analyse the resources and discuss the key concept • understood the 'big picture' of the environment and the issues facing it • could come to a justified conclusion by considering the causes of the water scarcity facing Las Vegas • could identify and integrate appropriate detailed evidence from all the resources provided.
<p>Standard specific comments</p>	<p>Candidates need to ensure that they read the questions carefully and do not try to pre-empt them. Many candidates wrote answers that followed previous exam formats where the questions considered causes in question two and consequences in question three which was not the way questions were asked in 2015. Candidates need to be able to identify key command words in each question and answer appropriately. Where a question requires more than one cause or consequence candidates are unlikely to be able to score high grades if they only provide one detailed example.</p>