

This assessment report is based on assessments for 2023. It may not reflect achievement standards that have been updated.

2023 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	Geography (RAS)
Level:	Level 1
Achievement standard(s):	91934, 91935

General commentary

These two standards form the external assessment for the Level 1 realignment of standards.

Report on individual achievement standards

Achievement standard 91934: Demonstrate understanding of how natural processes shape an environment

Assessment

The mode of assessment was a report. Candidates had up to 6 hours of class time to complete a report which showed their understanding of how natural processes shape a chosen environment and the implications of this to people.

Candidates completed the set tasks in a closed book, examination-style environment and handed in all of their work at the end of each session.

Commentary

There was a clear element of rote learning to the submissions and similarity of both written and visual aspects of submissions.

The selection and foregrounding of environment are very important in this standard. Most candidates chose an appropriate environment to discuss, that was clearly defined and enabled appropriate discussion on their chosen natural processes. In some candidate responses, the chosen environment was not made clear throughout the response, which made it difficult for them to show their understanding of how an environment has been shaped by natural processes. Candidates who based their discussion on one environment supplied more relevant and precise responses than those who discussed more than one environment. Some candidates focused their report on the processes rather than the environment or discussed how one process shaped one environment, and how a second process shaped a different environment. These responses were less successful.

More successful candidates showed their understanding of how natural processes shaped an environment by drawing a map(s) of the environment. This showed how and where the processes were operating and the location of landforms or features that they have produced.

More able candidates effectively linked the natural processes to the landforms or features they have produced. This allowed them to show their understanding of how the process have shaped the environment.

The choice of natural processes was also important. Candidates who discussed processes with a clear sequence of actions were more likely to explain the process, which was a requirement to achieve with Merit or Excellence. It is imperative that the processes selected facilitate a straightforward discussion of how they operate. Candidates who discussed more predictable and measurable processes, such as longshore drift, subduction, orographic rainfall, fluvial erosion, etc. wrote more effective explanations than those who chose more complex processes, such as sea level rise or storms.

Discussion about the implications of the natural processes was necessary to achieve with Excellence. More able candidates linked the natural processes they discussed earlier in the report to an effect (positive or negative) they are having on people. For example, a candidate who discussed fluvial deposition as a process could then discuss how that has created floodplains that enable ease of transport, building and cropping.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- described two chosen natural processes
- linked the natural processes to some features in the environment they have shaped
- supported the discussion by including relevant diagrams
- used some case study evidence to support their discussion
- included some geographic terminology to support their discussion.

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

- supplied a map that showed the spatial nature of their chosen environment
- explained two chosen natural processes by discussing some sequence of actions that caused them
- linked the natural processes to features in the environment they have shaped
- supported the discussion by including relevant diagrams
- used a range of case study evidence to support their discussion
- included a range of geographic terminology to support their discussion.

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

- supplied a clearly labelled or annotated map that showed the spatial nature of their chosen environment
- explained two chosen natural processes by discussing the sequence of actions that caused them
- linked the natural processes to a range of features in the environment they have shaped
- supported the discussion by including relevant and well labelled or annotated diagrams
- linked the natural processes to a range of implications they have for people
- integrated case study evidence throughout to support their discussion
- included a wide range of geographic terminology to support their discussion.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- did not clearly communicate the environment they were discussing
 - showed insufficient understanding of the spatial nature of their chosen environment
 - discussed features of the environment rather than natural processes
 - did not include sufficient relevant case study evidence.
-

Achievement standard 91935: Demonstrate understanding of decision-making in response to a geographic challenge in the wider Pacific region

Assessment

This standard was digitally assessed by examination. A resource booklet based on the key aspects of the Cook Islands environment was released prior to the examination.

Supplementary resources relating to a particular challenge the Cook Islands are facing was introduced at the start of the examination. In this case, the challenge was safeguarding the future Cook Islands economy, and in particular, whether to allow deep sea mining of polymetallic nodules to occur.

Commentary

Most candidates showed that they could identify a particular challenge, discuss people's thoughts and opinions on the challenge and then make a decision in relation to the challenge.

It is important to note that the challenge is future focused, and candidates need to clearly communicate this in their response.

Successful candidates aligned a perspective to a viewpoint by discussing the values people hold and what is important to them in relation to the challenge. This allowed candidates to fully explain the viewpoints that individuals or groups have on the challenge. Candidates who conflated viewpoints and perspectives were less successful.

When making a decision, it is important that candidates discuss what each group or individual would think about this decision, rather than simply discussing the decision's perceived strengths and weaknesses.

It is also important that when candidates evaluate the individual's or group's perspectives in relation to a decision, the perspective which was deemed to be most important is aligned to the decision that was made.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- outlined the nature of the challenge by referring to the future
- described a range of perspectives or viewpoints
- made a decision based on people's viewpoints or perspectives
- used some supporting evidence to support their discussion.

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

- explained how perspectives can influence viewpoints
- made a decision based on a range of people's viewpoints and perspectives
- used a range of supporting evidence to support their discussion.

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

- explained how perspectives can influence a wide variety of viewpoints
- made a well-considered decision based on a wide range of people's viewpoints or perspectives
- evaluated perspectives by choosing which was the most influential in making the decision
- integrated supporting evidence in their discussion.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- did not identify the challenge in terms of the future
 - did not describe a range of perspectives or viewpoints
 - did not make a decision that was supported with relevant information
 - used insufficient supporting evidence.
-