



NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

Scholarship, 2005

English
93001

National Statistics

Assessment Report

**English, Scholarship, 2005
93001**

National Statistics

No. Scholarship Results	Results			
	Outstanding	Scholarship	Scholarship	
	No. Awards	% of L3 Cohort	No. Awards	% of L3 Cohort
394	46	0.3%	348	2.4%

Commentary

In general candidates who performed well in the scholarship examination showed:

- extensive knowledge of texts and the methods used in crafting them
- ability to respond critically with mature ideas and independent reflection
- ability to sustain a coherent, substantiated and engaging argument.

Candidates who did not perform well often provided only limited interpretation of the two passages in Section 1, tried to fit prepared essays to questions in Section 2 or did not integrate their discussion in Section 3.

The best-performing candidates most commonly demonstrated the following skills and / or knowledge:

- ability to engage fully with the two texts in Section 1, and to sustain a balanced discussion of numerous features used in crafting both
- ability in Section 2 to discuss one or more texts in depth with critical appreciation and reflection, and to sustain an argument. A large proportion chose to use their extensive knowledge of Shakespeare texts to very good advantage in this section
- ability in Section 3 to develop a sustained critical response across a range of texts
- ability to write in ways which articulated and synthesised materials maturely, and with perception and focus
- ability to clearly engage with their texts and develop responses which in many instances conveyed a strong sense of conviction and original thought.

Other candidates commonly lacked the following skills and / or knowledge:

- ability in Section 1 to integrate their discussion of language and meaning, and to structure their essays using the guidelines provided as a basis for wider discussion. Weaker candidates tended to use the guidelines rigidly, methodically working through

each text. At times this impeded their discussion as they failed to explore and extend the possibilities that the passages offered

- ability in Section 2 to explore the full possibilities of the text as they attempted to fit a learned essay to the question. Misinterpreting a question, deliberately skewing a question or addressing only part of the question were common problems.
- ability to address the topic, to flesh out their understanding and draw up the parameters of their discussion. Cursory acknowledgement of the topic, followed by a film /novel / Shakespearean essay, did little to explore the ideas that were central to the interpretation required in this section. Candidates needed to discuss more than one text and give a coherent, integrated discussion. Weaker candidates tended to write about two texts as though they were writing two separate essays, and then rather weakly attempted to link them together in the conclusion.