

Scholarship

2010 Assessment Report

Geography

COMMENTARY

Candidates who gained a clear overview and understanding of the issues of pollution through the resource materials provided were able to achieve well across all aspects of the paper. Those candidates who selected relevant information to write focused answers in a concise and fluent manner, were identified as being good geography scholars. These candidates used sophisticated language, had few grammatical errors and were accurate spellers. They incorporated relevant visuals, within their writing, that were adapted or original, and were clearly referred to within the body of the essay. Some candidates presented excellent visuals that showed flair and originality.

The ability to incorporate geographic ideas, geographic terminology, and to generalize within answers (without making inaccurate statements) was also a feature of the best answers.

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

SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- planned their answers carefully to ensure a concisely written and fluent argument
- drew on topic knowledge from outside the resources, which allowed them to gain high grades
- wrote fluently with ideas that were well explained and easy to follow
- backed up all arguments with reference to case study material
- applied critical thinking skills and sound analysis to the evidence given
- understood the nature and scope of the discipline of geography to support the answers
- extracted and distilled relevant information from the resources to write essays that were concise, clear and geographic.

SCHOLARSHIP

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

- wrote sound answers backed up with case study material
- followed the examiners instructions carefully and were able to critically evaluate, justify and discuss as required
- backed up statements with some evidence from the case studies in the resource booklet
- understood linkages of cause and effect of environmental pollution and were able to draw simple diagrams showing correct linkages.

OTHER CANDIDATES

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

- did not follow instructions in the questions
- over generalised and were simplistic in their answers, which lacked the required depth
- were unable to critically evaluate, justify, analyse or integrate key skills required for Scholarship
- wrote answers that lacked structure and ideas presented were jumbled and confused

- showed little evidence of understanding simple geographic key concepts and terms
- copied large sections of information from the resource booklet rather than selecting and processing information for inclusion within an answer
- included Maori concepts and terms, referred to by the Scholarship Geography performance standard, in an indiscriminate and sometimes irrelevant way
- wrote a list of the important geographical ideas with no apparent reason, or highlighted and underlined these throughout their answers
- inappropriately highlighted and underlined a significant part of their scripts
- made incorrect sweeping generalisations such as, “Africa is poor” or “Africa is a country that...”
- used non-geographic terminology e.g. massive, hugely, majorly.