Scholarship

2013 Assessment Report

Biology

COMMENTARY

In 2013 the successful candidates were able to integrate their biological knowledge with information provided in the context of the question. Many candidates needed to address all aspects of a question equally and not focus on only any one part. Also many did not complete the last question. Some candidates needed to ensure that their script was legible. In such instances, evidence may have been missed or not acknowledged. There were few void scripts but there were a lot of very weak responses from candidates.

SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- wrote detailed and specific answers to all three questions
- addressed all parts of each question (breadth) in great detail (depth)
- used all of the resource material to answer each question
- demonstrated their knowledge of biological concepts by making links and justifications that were not immediately apparent from the information given
- analysed and interpreted data accurately and were able to make inferences from it.

SCHOLARSHIP

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

- used most of the resource material to answer each question
- addressed all parts of a question with limited details or some parts of a question in great detail (breadth or depth)
- wrote detailed answers to two of the three questions
- were able to correctly interpret experimental data.

OTHER CANDIDATES

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

- did not use the resource material to answer each question
- lacked breadth and depth in their answers to each question
- repeated or summarised the resource material without addressing the question
- wrote information that did not relate to the question even though it may be biologically correct
- wrote answers that contained biologically incorrect information
- were unable to analyse the data in question three
- did not show understanding of the meaning of “fauna”, confusing it with flora
- showed a lack of understanding of ‘community composition’
- did not recognise that Congo river would lead to allopatric not sympatric speciation
- did not know the difference between the bottleneck and founder effects
- failed to make the connection that lack of insects in the sprayed plot led to the change in community composition
- did not understand that lack of resources leads to competition

- showed a lack of understanding that competition leads to aggressive behaviour rather than territoriality leading to competition
- gave answers that contained indecipherable writing
- did not complete all questions
- had poor understanding of what genetic drift is
- showed a lack of understanding about the bioaccumulation of lead
- lacked knowledge that cyanide causes poisoning.