

2024 NCEA Assessment Report

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

General commentary

Overall, candidates performed well when they answered the questions in the assessment tasks. Reading instructions carefully and following them, rather than providing unnecessary or unsolicited information, was key to achievement in both standards. Candidates who demonstrated a more precise and effective use of geographic terminology were more successful.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

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

Assessment

A submitted report which assessed candidates' ability to:

- identify natural features and/or characteristics in an environment
- explain how two processes contributed to the formation of these features and/or characteristics
- explain the impacts and implications of natural processes on people.

Commentary

Part A required candidates to select an environment that was similar to one which they had studied during the year. Its purpose was to allow candidates to apply their understanding of how natural processes shape an environment, rather than provide rote learned responses from a case study covered during the year. Specific environment or case study detail was not required for this skills-based part of the assessment.

Candidates were then required to provide and annotate relevant resources (maps and/or photographs) that showed the features and characteristics of their selected environment and discuss how two natural processes would have helped to shape some of these features.

It is important to note that the final choice for the selection of the chosen environment was to be the candidate's. In addition, teacher help was not permitted in the selection of resources to be used in the assessment.

Part B required candidates to discuss the wider impacts that the natural processes have had on people in the case study environment studied during the year. For this assessment, wider impacts were considered to be those which were both positive and negative. This is an important distinction, as a number of candidates focused their entire response on an extreme natural event, rather than an environment that has been shaped by natural processes over time. These candidates were not able to convey the wider impacts of the processes, and the positive contribution they can make to

people's lives. For example, the impacts of fluvial processes can be positive, as they build flood plains that provide fertile soils for farming, but also have negative impacts during flood events.

Additionally, candidates were required to discuss the implications of the natural processes to achieve with Excellence. Candidates who discussed the implications by considering the threats and/or opportunities provided by the natural processes, scored well in this part of the question.

It is important to note that when showing understanding of a natural process, candidates must refer to the series/sequence of events that contribute to it. Those candidates who were able to show understanding of how a process operates, and then link the process to the features and/or characteristics in an environment they have formed, scored well. For example, when explaining how process of longshore drift contributed to the formation of a spit, candidates who discussed the wind direction, angle of swash, angle of backwash, and the repetition of wave action, were better able to link this process to the movement of sediment along a coast and subsequent spit formation.

Candidates who were able to discuss how natural processes can shape an environment (features/characteristics and impacts on people) over time were better able to meet the requirements of the standard. Candidates who focused their response solely on an extreme natural event showed a lack of holistic understanding of the standard.

Candidates who used geographic terminology in both the identification of features and explanation of natural processes scored well. It is expected that a Level One Geography student is able to identify specific geographic features in an environment (e.g. stack, spit, meander, U-shaped valley, floodplain, vent, stratovolcano, etc).

It is also important that candidates read the instructions in the assessment clearly. This assessment required candidates to discuss two environments:

- their course case study environment
- another environment that was similar to it in terms of its features and characteristics.

Candidates who used their course environment case study for the whole paper were not able not achieve this standard.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- labelled maps and/or photographs to identify appropriate and specific phenomena in an environment
- described at least one natural process as a sequence of events
- described one of the positive/negative/future impacts of at least one natural process on people
- included some relevant evidence
- included some geographic terminology.

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

- labelled maps and/or photographs to identify a range of appropriate and specific phenomena in an environment
- explained two natural processes as a sequence of events
- linked the natural processes to the phenomena identified in an environment
- discussed two of the positive/negative/future impacts of at least one natural process on people
- included a range of relevant evidence
- included a range of geographic terminology.

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

- labelled maps and/or photographs to identify a range of appropriate and specific phenomena in an environment

- explained two natural processes as a sequence of events
- linked the natural processes to the phenomena identified in an environment
- discussed the wider (positive and negative) impacts, and future implications of at least one natural process on people
- included a wide range of relevant contextualised evidence
- included a wide range of accurate geographic terminology.

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

- could not identify natural phenomena in a selected environment
- did not discuss a natural process as being a sequence of events
- did not link a natural process to the phenomena it forms
- identified impacts of natural processes on an environment but did not describe them
- used the same environment for both Part A and Part B.

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

Assessment

This examination assessed candidates' understanding of a geographic challenge; the viewpoints and perspectives that people have in response to the challenge, and how these viewpoints and perspectives contribute to decision making. A pre-released resource booklet was provided before the examination to provide contextual understanding of the Waimārama environment. A new resource booklet, which contained both the pre-released and new material, was provided to candidates in the examination.

Commentary

The pre-released material was used by some candidates to show their deeper understanding of the Waimārama environment. These candidates were also better able to use vocabulary that was appropriate to the challenge (e.g. spinifex grass, erosion rate, longshore drift, dune formation, kaitiakitanga, perennial, redoubt, esplanade, etc). The use of the pre-released material is encouraged in future assessment as it enhances a candidate's ability to show a holistic understanding of the environment in question.

Some candidates went into the assessment with preconceived ideas about what the challenge was, which limited their ability to provide relevant responses. For example, some candidates discussed sand mining as the challenge, and therefore they could not achieve the standard.

A number of candidates were unable to show their understanding of the difference between a viewpoint and a perspective. Additionally, candidates were required to discuss the viewpoint and perspective of each individual in the resource booklet, in relation to the options provided. Those candidates who simply repeated the information from the resources were not able to adequately do this.

When making a decision in response to a geographic challenge, candidates are required to discuss how each individual's viewpoint and perspective contributed to their making of the decision, rather than only discussing the strengths and weaknesses of each option.

When discussing why one perspective was more important than the others, some successful candidates were able to demonstrate the holistic nature of decision making by showing that one group's viewpoint incorporated a range of perspectives.

Candidates should be encouraged to practice drafting and proof-reading responses before getting into the examination.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- identified the challenge as being access to the beach
- demonstrated understanding of a viewpoint
- used limited resource material to support their response.

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

- identified the challenge as conflict over access, with detail to support the response
- demonstrated understanding of the difference between a viewpoint and a perspective
- explained why the chosen option was better than the others, with detail to support their decision
- demonstrated that this decision should be made in the best interests in a wide group of people, not their individual choice
- used a range of resource material to support the response.

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

- demonstrated a clear understanding of the holistic nature of decision making
- showed a clear understanding of how people's viewpoints and perspectives contribute to decision making
- used a wide range of resource material from both the pre-release and stimulus booklets to support the response
- incorporated accurate geographic terminology.

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

- did not demonstrate an understanding of the questions
- could not identify the challenge
- could not demonstrate understanding of a viewpoint or perspective.