

2024 NCEA Assessment Report

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

General commentary

Candidates who used geographic terminology and language achieved to higher levels. Integration of case study information throughout responses demonstrated better understanding. Candidates who referenced out-of-date or inaccurate case study information could not achieve to higher levels.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

Achievement standard 91420: Demonstrate geographic understanding of a large natural environment

Commentary

Candidates were generally well-prepared and able to demonstrate their understanding of how a large natural environment is formed and changes over time, along with people's perceptions of this environment. Incorporation of detailed and annotated diagrams within candidate answers helped demonstrate a higher level of understanding of the environment. Case studies which focused on large natural environments were more likely to provide enough information to cover all aspects of the assessment.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- provided limited case study material for some parts of the response
- completed responses that were often general or discursive.

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

- addressed all aspects of the question
- displayed a greater depth of understanding of Geographic processes
- included more detailed case study across the response.

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

- provided comprehensive answers which demonstrated a depth of understanding
- integrated comprehensive case study detail
- comprehensively applied geographic concepts
- included detailed annotated diagrams
- provided answers that were well-structured, clear, concise, and insightful.

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

- did not address the question or attempted to use a pre-prepared answer
- provided incomplete answers
- included only cultural changes to their environment
- provided no or insufficient case study evidence.

Achievement standard 91242: Demonstrate geographic understanding of differences in development

Commentary

Candidates were required to demonstrate understanding of differences in development between case study areas. Candidates who focused on only one area, or where the second case study was implied or only briefly discussed, were unable to demonstrate any difference (in development). This restricted access to the higher grades.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- lacked supporting case study evidence and therefore wrote more general responses
- completed only basic explanation of factors and/or strategies
- provided answers with a limited structure as they did not use the planning space provided.

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

- included detailed case study evidence
- provided detailed explanation of factors and strategies influencing development
- provided responses where one case study environment may have been lacking in overall detail/evidence
- described several factors instead of showing depth of understanding of one factor
- demonstrated an effective use of the planning box to evidence thinking with logical structure.

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

- integrated case study evidence throughout to enhance and fully develop their response
- demonstrated a clear understanding of the assessment and standard requirements
- provided thorough explanations, factors, and strategies, to logically illustrate how levels of development were influenced
- identified two case study environments and included comparative data for both, clearly indicating levels of development of each environment
- included an even balance of both case study environments within their responses
- demonstrated a high level of literacy to provide comprehensive answers with a depth of understanding.

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

- completed descriptive responses that lacked explanation of factors or strategies
- answered one part with limited explanation of task requirements and left the other part blank
- provided a paragraph response which did not offer enough explanation and detail to achieve
- wrote off-topic responses that did not address the requirements of the question

- demonstrated a lower level of understanding of differences in development between two different case study environments.
-

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

Commentary

Candidates were required to show their geographic skills and understanding of concepts in the context of the provided environment. The provided case study context was used to demonstrate understanding of the environment.

It was pleasing to see candidates continuing to show a clear understanding of mapping skills and conventions, as this is a key geographic skill.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- completed all parts of the examination
- provided only minimal supporting evidence
- demonstrated some skill in mapping, however there were some inaccuracies or missing details affecting the overall quality of the map
- mentioned social, environmental, and economic aspects in part (c), but any explanation lacked depth, often copying information directly from the resource booklet.

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

- followed mapping conventions with a high degree of accuracy and minimal errors
- identified and described graph patterns in relation to geographic concepts
- supported answers with specific evidence from resources, and started to integrate it to explain geographic concepts in some detail
- used some relevant geographic terminology to support their explanations.

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

- demonstrated a high level of skill in completing mapping tasks – all conventions evident and located features on the precis map with a high degree of accuracy in the correct size, shape, and location
- applied geographic concepts (like change, pattern, and sustainability) explicitly, writing specifically to the question
- made real-world connections (e.g., inflation, cost of living) to demonstrate depth and insight
- utilised the planning page effectively for long-answer questions, ensuring all parts of the paper were connected in the final response
- supported answers with a wide range of integrated, specific evidence and linked concepts throughout the response.

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

- did not attempt the entire paper
- made errors in mapping features accurately and/or did not include some key mapping conventions
- lacked supporting evidence in responses, and if used, this evidence did not relate to answering the question

- were unable to correctly identify social, economic, and environmental factors in the provided resources.
-