

Scholarship

2009 Assessment Report

Geography

COMMENTARY

Many candidates did not consistently use proper geographical language, but used non-geographic terms, such as *massive* or *veggies*.

Many candidates did not answer the question asked, for example; approximately a third of candidates wrote about global warming in Question 3 when the focus should have been on the global food crisis.

Some candidates answered parts of the paper very well, but left the examination early (according to exit times noted by supervisors on the exam paper) with parts of the paper not attempted.

The ablest candidates clearly synthesised and explained the issues of the food crisis according to the resource materials provided. Candidates who demonstrated good geographical skills used correct geographic terminology, generalised within their answers (without making inaccurate statements) and showed geographical awareness of spatial and temporal scales such as the difference between continents and countries and long term consequences.

Illustrated essays were a feature of this examination whereby candidates were asked to produce appropriate visuals to support their answer. The more successful candidates incorporated relevant visuals within their writing. They used adapted or original graphs, maps, flow diagrams and diagrams that were clearly referred to within the body of the essay. There were some excellent visuals prepared by candidates that showed flair and originality, although these were few.

SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- critically analysed the information on the food crisis
- showed insight into the topic and communicated information succinctly
- extracted and distilled relevant information from the resources and wrote essays that were concise, clear and geographic
- wrote with a high level of integration and abstraction and in a concise and fluent manner that showed understanding of the question; incorporated geographic information throughout the answer; wrote answers that provided geographic generalisations and overviews, as well as specifics.

SCHOLARSHIP

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship but not Scholarship with Outstanding Performance commonly:

- answered all of the questions, and answered the topic of the questions, showing careful analysis before beginning to answer
- planned their answers using the resources provided
- used the bolded words in the questions and the quotations provided within Questions 1 and 2 (in italics) to help guide and shape answers
- showed familiarity with, and understanding of the nature and scope of the discipline of geography to support the answers
- showed a clear understanding of geography and used this to expand on their answers

- extracted and distilled relevant information from the resources to produce visuals that were concise, clear and geographic
- added explanation and additional information to the text of the essay to enhance the answer
- showed a correct understanding of perspectives provided in the resources
- responded to the whole of the question on people and places (*places* could have been interpreted in a variety of ways based on the resources provided, all of which, if relevant, were credited)
- showed long term consequences resulting from the food crisis which incorporated a clear indication of time in the future e.g. a date from the resources
- identified one clear long term consequence and explained in full while clearly showing why it was more significant than other long term consequences.

OTHER CANDIDATES

Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship or Scholarship with Outstanding Performance commonly:

- copied large sections of information from the resource booklet rather than selecting and processing information for inclusion within an answer
- included perspectives that were not relevant
- included Māori concepts and terms in an indiscriminate way whether they were relevant or not
- wrote a list of the important geographical ideas with no apparent reason
- inappropriately highlighted and underlined a significant part of their scripts
- made comments about what geography is rather than answering the question that was asked
- made incorrect sweeping generalisations such as, “Africa is poor”, “Africa has no rain”, “Africa is a country that...” and “all LEDCs are poor and malnourished”
- provided well drawn copied diagrams/visuals which did not contribute to the answer
- did not demonstrate the skills, ideas and understandings to the necessary level
- did not distinguish between *affect* and *effect*.