

Scholarship

2014 Assessment Report

Geography

SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance commonly:

- planned their response
- used sophisticated language
- integrated specific detail from their own knowledge and the resource booklet
- showed perception and insight
- used convincing communication in their essays
- included a relevant visual to enhance their answer
- addressed all parts of each question
- completed all questions.

SCHOLARSHIP

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

- answered all three questions
- included a range of evidence
- included visuals to enhance their answer
- used examples from beyond the resource booklet to illustrate their ideas
- used correct geographic terminology throughout their answers
- planned their answers
- wrote clearly and concisely.

OTHER CANDIDATES

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

- did not complete all questions
- copied large sections of the resource booklet
- did not answer the questions asked, or they did not address all parts of the question
- did not understand the command words – critically analyse, discuss and justify
- did not refer to perspectives
- wrote information that did not relate to the question
- wrote answers that contained geographically incorrect information.

OTHER COMMENTS

In 2014, the successful candidates were well prepared with an understanding of the topic (urbanisation, urban settlements and urban growth) and of the scholarship standard. These candidates were able to integrate their geographical knowledge about urbanisation and the future of cities with the information provided in the context of the question. These candidates brought information into the examination with them and used it to illustrate their ideas. These candidates were able to see the “big picture”; they had a good conceptual understanding of urban geography. They were able to support their arguments with a broad range of evidence.

The best answers were planned and were written succinctly. Candidates used language concisely and precisely incorporating appropriate geographical language. Those

candidates who read the examination questions and the resource booklets carefully, planned their answers using resources provided in the resource booklet and from beyond. These candidates were able to write concisely rather than getting bogged down in copying large portions of information from the resource booklet. Candidates used the key words from the questions to keep their answer focussed and to link it to their own knowledge. These candidates were well prepared with appropriate quotes and a range of relevant case studies. Visuals that were well-planned, enhanced their answers. Visuals were more likely to be effective if they took the form of maps, graphs, flow diagrams and Venn diagrams rather than “pictures”.

Answers that were less successful were often unplanned and as a consequence were poorly structured, often large sections of the resource booklet being copied. These candidates did not see the big picture. These candidates often included simplistic statements and sweeping generalisations. Visuals, if included, were often non geographic and were not referred to in the body of the essay. Candidates often, having drawn a visual, then wrote only a description of the visual; so the visual did not enhance their answer. Some candidates failed to reference their diagrams or simply did not include them – these were required for two of the three questions.

Candidates did not understand command language or geographic terms associated with the topic. In question one, candidates were unable to distinguish between form and the role or function of cities and struggled to critically analyse.

In question 2, many candidates failed to include reference or discussion about perspectives. They needed to address all aspects of a question and not focus on only any one part. Candidates should be aware of the differences between perspectives and point of view.

The approaches to question 3 generally revolved around sustainability. However, this was not the only option. Discuss means to argue both sides and reach a justified conclusion.

Many did not complete their final question. Some candidates' scripts were not legible or words were difficult to understand. In such instances, evidence may have been missed or not acknowledged.