

# 2024 NCEA Assessment Report

<b>Subject:</b>	Psychology
<b>Level:</b>	3
<b>Achievement standard(s):</b>	91876

## General commentary

Overall, most candidates effectively analysed a significant issue in psychological practice using their selected case study. The case studies provided a range of details that could be referred to when discussing the issue. Candidates who were successful addressed all components of the three tasks and effectively related their responses to both their selected case study and psychological practice.

Thoughtful selection of psychological evidence (e.g. studies, theories) enabled in-depth analyses of the issue. Candidates are encouraged to use psychological evidence that demonstrates the significant issue in different ways. For example, discussing both alpha and beta bias with reference to Freud and Kohlberg. By contrast, focusing solely on studies that present the issue in similar ways (e.g. Asch and Zimbardo, emphasising their use of American male participants) may limit the depth of analysis.

When discussing the use of animals in research, responses that incorporated specific terminology (e.g. speciesism) and extended beyond discussions of harm tended to demonstrate a deeper understanding. This could include addressing ethical issues (e.g. the inability to obtain consent), the application of animal research to human behaviour or cost-benefit analysis.

## Report on individual achievement standard(s)

### Achievement standard 91876: Analyse a significant issue in psychological practice

#### Assessment

Three case studies were provided. Candidates were required to select one of the case studies and respond to one question with three parts.

#### Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- identified and explained a significant issue in psychological practice, making connections to the selected case study
- clearly explained the issue in relation to psychological practice, often using descriptions of psychological evidence (e.g. studies, theories) to support their responses. However, these explanations were typically general or limited to a few specific details
- defined subject-specific terminology (e.g. alpha bias, beta bias) and applied these to the case study and / or psychological practice.

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

- explained, in depth, how the significant issue is evident in psychological practice, making specific connections to the selected case study
- applied subject-specific terminology (e.g. alpha and beta bias), in some detail, to the case study (e.g. “The first psychologist that Sarah met with demonstrated beta bias because he did not acknowledge that males and females have different experiences of ADHD”)
- provided detailed descriptions of at least two carefully selected examples of psychological evidence (e.g. studies, theories) and explained how this evidence demonstrated the issue. Additional commentary or research may have been included as counterarguments (for example, using Horney to critique Freud’s work)
- attempted to discuss strategies to address the issue. However, these lacked sufficient detail for Excellence.

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

- comprehensively analysed how the significant issue affects psychological practice, making specific and detailed connections to the selected case study throughout the response. Subject-specific terminology (e.g. alpha and beta bias) was consistently and accurately integrated throughout
- provided detailed descriptions of carefully selected supporting psychological evidence (e.g. studies, theories) and explained, in detail, how this evidence illustrates the issue. Broader insights may have connected the evidence / issue to societal contexts (e.g. racism) that have impacted psychological practice
- identified and discussed at least two distinct strategies to address the issue in psychological practice. These strategies were specific, realistic, clearly articulated, and grounded in evidence, with a clear explanation of how they would effectively address the issue. At least one strategy may have been explicitly linked to the case study
- considered the limitations and / or potential consequences of these strategies within psychological practice.

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

- failed to clearly identify the significant issue (e.g. cultural bias) demonstrated in the selected case study
  - made no reference to the case study or focused solely on the case study without connecting it to psychological practice
  - repeated information from the case study without providing further explanation or analysis
  - lacked understanding of the issue in psychological practice, potentially focusing on broader societal issues (e.g. racism or sexism) instead.
-