

2023 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	Geography
Level:	Level 2
Achievement standard(s):	91240, 91242, 91243

General commentary

These assessments require the use of case study information and candidates who understood their case study environments tended to achieve at a higher level. This is also relevant for the 91243 paper where the case study information is provided in the resource booklet.

Candidates who integrated geographic concepts appropriately in their responses also achieved to a higher level.

Reading and understanding the question is of great importance as candidates who did not answer the set question, did not achieve the task. Seemingly pre-prepared responses were often self-penalising, as they did not fully or relevantly answer the questions.

Report on individual achievement standards

Achievement standard 91240: Demonstrate geographic understanding of a large natural environment

Assessment

The standard and quality of candidate responses continues to improve and the use of case study information was thorough.

Commentary

The assessment task allowed candidates to show their depth of understanding of the natural processes and elements interacting within their chosen environment.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- showed understanding of one or more processes
- used basic, general examples to illustrate.

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

- wrote detailed answers with a high level of explanation
- provided detailed case study information

- demonstrated understanding of land building and land modifying process when discussing relief
- included relevant interactions.

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

- integrated advanced geographic terminology into their responses
- provided comprehensive case study information
- explained complex interaction between the elements and processes in their chosen environment.

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

- included human interactions
- lacked general case study information
- wrote a response without sufficient detail.

Achievement standard 91242: Demonstrate geographic understanding of differences in development

Assessment

Part (a) of the question required the candidates to show their understanding of the disadvantages of using an indicator to measure differences in development. Part (b) required candidates to demonstrate an understanding of a factor that has contributed to the differences in development, providing explanations and case study evidence from different locations, to support their response.

Commentary

Candidates who tailored their response to the question set in the exam produced better responses than those who appeared to rely on pre-prepared answers that were sometimes not directly relevant to the question.

Candidates who focused on one factor for different locations demonstrated comprehensive understanding. Some candidates started the response with one factor and finished with another showing inconsistency of their chosen factors, which led to a weaker response.

Gender inequality as a chosen factor was more successful when there was a locational element to the response; candidates must ensure they choose to write about two different locations and not groups of people.

Some candidates focused on levels of development and how extreme natural events impacted on a location due to current levels of development, which also meant that they did not answer the set question.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- wrote general responses with some geographic terms and concepts
- lacked detailed supporting evidence, e.g. one part of the answer may have had very limited evidence or evidence was not used effectively to support the explanation
- demonstrated understanding but needed a more detailed explanation of *how* an indicator had disadvantages to measuring differences in development and *how* factors caused differences in development
- lacked detail of actual differences in development between two case study areas
- focused on one case study area and the other was implied.

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

- integrated detail, such as case study evidence, to support their answer
- focused on two case study areas and developed their responses around the differences in development between the two chosen areas
- explained the differences between the two case study areas explicitly.

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

- understood the requirements of the exam questions and the achievement standard
- showed very clear geographic understanding and application of concepts
- explained multiple, detailed disadvantages of using indicators to measure differences in development in part (a)
- focused effectively on how indicators could be used to measure differences in development between places, integrating supporting evidence
- demonstrated geographic insight into differences in development between two case study areas and developed comprehensive explanations
- integrated developing / flow-on ideas to show the impacts on development in either a positive or negative way.

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

- did not answer the questions
- provided descriptions rather than explanations with reasons
- wrote general responses that were not overly geographic or specific to locations
- lacked geographic understanding of differences in development
- did not focus on differences in development between two locations, often writing a generic discussion of development in only one location
- stated only the advantages of an indicator in part (a)
- wrote about strategies rather than factors in part (b)
- lacked enough evidence of case studies to meet the standard, for example writing only one straightforward paragraph.

Achievement standard 91243: Apply geographic concepts and skills to demonstrate understanding of a given environment

Assessment

The assessment consisted of one question with multiple parts. The resource booklet provided all necessary evidence and case study information.

Commentary

Location is very important in Geography and should form an essential part of any response. Candidates who located the environment in their responses tended to achieve at a higher level. Some candidates did not locate Lake Mead, did not use evidence, or referred to aspects of the cultural environment (for example, the Hoover Dam controls the flow of the river protecting the farms from flooding) when writing about natural environment in the first part of the question. Candidates who appeared to read instructions more carefully demonstrated effective responses that focused on producing the right amount of detail for the question asked.

Candidates producing effective mapping and stronger answers used the concept words throughout. Unpacking the concepts in detail for the final part of the question was essential to achieve at a higher level.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- responded appropriately to most instructions
- gave general evidence
- stated the concept (or many concepts) and copied the concept definition(s) but did not actually apply it (them) to their answer
- were not always accurate with the mapping (creation and interpretation)
- referred to location once or twice.

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

- carefully responded to instructions
- used evidence from the resource booklet on a regular basis
- utilised concepts explicitly and applied them to the context
- were accurate in their application of skills
- used geographic conventions with accuracy in the skills section
- referred to the location.

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

- responded correctly to all instructions
- utilised concepts explicitly, applied them to the context, and unpacked the concept effectively
- used evidence comprehensively
- referred to the location regularly.

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

- did not respond according to the instructions
 - did not attempt all parts of the question
 - appeared to lack understanding of the natural environment
 - demonstrated inadequate mapping skills (creation and interpretation)
 - neglected to refer to location.
-