

# 2024 NCEA Assessment Report

<b>Subject:</b>	Geography
<b>Level:</b>	3
<b>Achievement standard(s):</b>	91426, 91427, 91429

## General commentary

Candidates should read all parts of the question in the examination papers carefully before starting their responses and must ensure instruction words are interpreted correctly.

Candidates benefited from using planning pages to help structure logical and detailed answers.

## Report on individual achievement standard(s)

### Achievement standard 91426: Demonstrate understanding of how interacting natural processes shape a New Zealand geographic environment

#### Assessment

The question asked of candidates was “How do interacting natural processes create spatial OR temporal variations in a New Zealand geographic environment?” Candidates were able to select from two options and could either analyse how spatial variations were created via interacting natural processes or how temporal variations were created via interacting natural processes.

#### Commentary

The question was clear, and candidates that focused on one aspect of either temporal or spatial variations from the outset yielded a more focused response. Candidates that moved between a spatial and temporal variation answer typically lacked sufficient depth in either aspect of their response. Overall, diagrams would have benefited from more detailed annotations, which could have aided candidates moving to higher levels of achievement.

#### Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- addressed all aspects of the question: interaction and operation of different processes that created spatial or temporal variations within an environment
- included some specific evidence about the interacting processes and the creation of spatial or temporal variations.

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

- wrote complete responses, with a good level of case study detail
- demonstrated sound understanding of the interaction of processes and the creation of spatial or temporal variations
- annotated a relevant diagram or map that helped to further develop the written response.

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

- provided an insightful analysis through a clearly articulated response, with relevant concluding statements
- demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of their environment through integrated use of relevant case study evidence
- explained how processes interacted using geographic terminology
- fully annotated diagrams and/or maps that were drawn in the space provided or throughout the written response.

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

- provided responses that did not address the question and demonstrated little evidence of understanding of temporal or spatial variations within their environment
- lacked sufficient case study evidence
- did not describe the interaction between processes
- wrote incomplete responses
- did not annotate their map and labelled their map with only names of features and locations.

---

## **Achievement standard 91427: Demonstrate understanding of how a cultural process shapes geographic environment(s)**

### **Assessment**

The assessment consisted of one question that required candidates to include a map or diagram to support their written response. The question asked of candidates was “How does a cultural process operate to impact a geographic environment(s) you have studied?” Candidates were required to integrate supporting case study evidence to demonstrate their geographic knowledge and understanding of a specific geographic environment and a cultural process that impacts it.

### **Commentary**

Tourism development was the most commonly selected cultural process. Impacts on the environment could be broken into the cultural and the natural environment. For the purpose of this question, impacts on people and spatial patterns were accepted as part of the cultural environment.

Candidates who wrote pre-learned responses on the operation of the process over time were restricted to lower grades, unless the changes in the operation of the process over time were clearly linked to impacts caused to their environment over time.

Candidates who wrote pre-learned responses on only the spatial patterns created by the operation process did not fully meet the requirements of the question and responses were consequently narrow in their understanding.

Responses that contained technical detail such as the use of models like the Butler model, theory like the bid-rent curve, cumulative causation, and geographic terms like allocentric or psychocentric, showed higher levels of understanding.

There were some issues with candidates writing about the impacts of Covid-19 without clear links to how this factor changed the operation of a cultural process, which then caused impacts on the environment.

A lack of clear, identifiable elements can be an issue for candidates that selected a more abstract cultural process. Answers could be detailed but were descriptive, as they lacked clear links between elements and/or explanation of how the process operated, which limited the quality of the response.

More successful candidates had selected a cultural process with clearly signposted elements, so that providing an insightful analysis of the links between the elements to draw conclusions was possible. Candidates who were able to show this level of understanding were able to demonstrate the achievement standard requirement for Excellence.

## Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- named a cultural process and a clearly defined geographic environment
- focused more on explaining the impacts rather than explaining the operation of the process as the cause of the impact
- were able to provide some simplistic reasoning that linked the operation of their selected cultural process to impacts on the environment
- described a range of impacts on the environment (natural and/or cultural) but most were not analysed with any depth.

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

- named a cultural process and a clearly defined geographic environment
- constructed a relevant map or diagram that illustrated impacts of a cultural process on their environment or that explained the operation of the cultural process
- demonstrated a detailed understanding of how a cultural process operates to cause impacts on the environment (natural and cultural)
- gave a generally in-depth analysis of a variety of impacts on both the natural and cultural environment, which were linked to how the operation of the cultural process caused each impact to occur
- provided detailed case study evidence relating to their selected geographic environment to support answers and some limited technical language to develop their reasoning.

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

- named a cultural process and a clearly defined geographic environment
- constructed a relevant map or diagram that related to their selected environment, illustrating impacts on the environment or helped to explain the operation of their selected cultural process
- demonstrated a comprehensive and insightful analysis of how a cultural process operates to cause impacts on the natural and cultural environment
- included an analysis of the links between elements of the cultural process, clearly connecting these links to the outcome of impacts on the natural and cultural environment
- integrated supporting case study evidence throughout and used correct geographic terminology or referenced appropriate geographic theory or models within their response
- expressed ideas logically and fluently by breaking impacts into subsequent categories, such as social, economic, short term, long term, positive, and negative, and may have weighed up the significance of impacts or ways in which they could be mitigated.

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

- did not name a cultural process or a defined geographic environment and the selection of a process or environment was not evident within the written response
- wrote an incomplete response
- did not include a map or diagram
- provided a response that focused solely on how the cultural process operated over time with no links as to how this caused impacts on the environment

- lacked sufficient analysis and only inferred reasons as to how the cultural process operated to impact on the environment
- wrote descriptive answers that focused only on the impacts without any links to how the operation of the cultural process caused these
- did not explain a sufficient range of impacts
- selected an inappropriate cultural process that did not allow for sufficient analysis of how it operates over time and space to cause impacts on the environment.

---

## Achievement standard 91429: Demonstrate understanding of a given environment(s) through selection and application of geographic concepts and skills

### Assessment

The case study provided was based on a clear and relevant geographic issue that candidates would have been able to understand, regardless of whether they had encountered this issue before. Candidates who were able to connect specific evidence from the resource booklet to their responses (as opposed to putting all evidence in one part of the answer), were more likely to achieve with Merit or Excellence.

### Commentary

It was noted that many candidates chose to complete their responses with inappropriate writing implements (e.g. colouring pencils) which made work difficult to decipher. Candidates should ensure that all responses are attempted in pen. Questions appeared to be accessible to candidates, but this didn't necessarily correspond to higher level responses. Candidates must ensure that they understand the requirements of key geographic terms so that responses are relevant. Candidates must also ensure that all questions are fully attempted. Successful candidates utilised resources to demonstrate their application of geographic skills and provided specific information from graphs and maps to show their understanding.

### Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- demonstrated a basic understanding of either temporal and/or spatial patterns in relation to Canadian wildfires
- identified perspectives held by one or more individuals or groups towards Canadian wildfires, but did not explain why these perspectives were held, or explained why perspectives were held by one group or individual only
- conflated viewpoints and perspectives, including two political viewpoints rather than two different perspectives
- outlined most commonly two types of impacts, e.g. social and economic
- copied significant amounts of information from the resource booklet which meant that they did not always contain sufficient specific evidence to support their points.

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

- demonstrated a sound understanding of either temporal and/or spatial patterns in relation to Canadian wildfires, with reference to geographic conventions
- used specific evidence and were able to connect particular patterns to certain parts of Canada
- focused on two temporal patterns and on annual pattern changes and/or changes over time

- identified two perspectives held by individuals and/or groups towards Canadian wildfires. Stronger answers clearly articulated why these perspectives were held. Weaker answers focused on one perspective more than the other, or only implied why these perspectives were held
- explained with detail throughout, a range of consequences of wildfires in Canada
- evaluated (or implied evaluation) of the consequences of these wildfires.

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

- demonstrated clearly an understanding of temporal and/or spatial patterns of wildfires
- used sound evidence to connect the patterns to locations or regions in Canada, or points in time
- used geographic skills explicitly, such as latitude and longitude coordinates, directions, naming places
- identified two perspectives held by individuals or groups towards Canadian wildfires, clearly explaining why these perspectives were held (explanations about Indigenous perspectives and political perspectives tended to be more successful than scientific perspectives)
- compared reasons for holding these perspectives, using key terms like 'value' and 'belief'
- explained, comprehensively, consequences of wildfires in Canada
- evaluated either various consequences throughout their response for part (c), or formed an evaluation summary paragraph at the end
- demonstrated insight through connecting various consequences with one another, or by grouping them into similar categories and evaluating the consequences for each category, rather than each individual consequence
- extrapolated the given evidence to discuss short and long term impacts in the most successful answers
- attempted an evaluation by stating which was the most significant impact, therefore not integrating evaluation properly through their response, in less successful answers.

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

- did not describe spatial or temporal patterns of Canadian wildfires, instead focused on describing the conditions needed to form wildfires
- produced unrelated statements about wildfires, or briefly described a pattern, without drawing on specific evidence to support this description, or connecting it to a relevant location in Canada
- wrote about viewpoints rather than perspectives
- wrote generally about individuals or groups who held perspectives towards Canadian wildfires, but either did not describe their perspective and why it was held, or relied on quoting individuals at length, without explaining what the quote meant or how it related to why a perspective was held
- did not attempt part (c), or briefly wrote general statements about wildfires in general (not specific to Canada)
- wrote general statements about consequences of wildfires in Canada, with no specific evidence used or evaluations made
- focused on one type of impact, e.g. social, rather than integrating multiple types of impacts
- provided brief responses which were lacking evidence from the resources or copied the resources in a way that did not answer the question properly.