

# 2015 NZ Scholarship Assessment Report

## Geography

### Part A: Commentary

Comment on the overall response of candidates to the 2015 examination.

In 2015, the successful candidates were well prepared with an understanding of the topic (agriculture) and of the scholarship standard.

These candidates were able to integrate their geographical knowledge about agriculture and the future of the agricultural industry with the information provided in the context of the question. These candidates brought information into the examination with them and used these case studies to illustrate their ideas. They were able to use this material to show their understanding of the importance of agriculture and its future. They clearly understood how different people or organisations had different perspectives on the challenges facing agriculture. For example, the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) are concerned with the ability of the world to feed the increasing population. They have a social perspective because their role requires them to look at food and agriculture across the globe. Another example might be “When evaluated from an environmental perspective, there is only one challenge that is undeniably the most significant – climate change” – the candidate could then go on to name a specific group and their concerns.

Candidates used the key words from the questions to give focused responses and linked it well to their own knowledge. 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, poorly structured and did not address the question. These candidates often included simplistic statements and sweeping generalisations. Visuals, were often non geographic, inappropriate irrelevant. Many candidates did not complete the final question.

Many candidates did not understand command language or geographic terms associated with the topic. In question one, candidates were unable to discuss. Discuss means to argue both sides and reach a justified conclusion.

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 points of view.

The approaches to question 3 needed to revolve around an argument about the similarities in the futures of MEDCs and LEDCs – there was no right or wrong answer to this.

Many candidates’ scripts were often to a significant extent, illegible. This was to their detriment. Markers, despite their best efforts, were often unable to read large portions of the script.

Candidates should practice writing examination answers under time constraints.

### Part B: Report on performance standard

<b>Scholarship with Outstanding Performance</b>	<p>Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>wrote concise and accurate answers.</li> <li>had a “big picture” overview which was backed up with case studies with specific and relevant information.</li> <li>used appropriate language</li> <li>discussed and argued their perspective with conviction.</li> <li>came prepared into the examination with relevant material to be used to illustrate their argument</li> <li>included appropriate and relevant original visuals to enhance their answers</li> <li>addressed all parts of the question.</li> </ul>
---	---

<b>Scholarship</b>	<p>Candidates who were awarded Scholarship commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• answered all three questions</li> <li>• used examples to illustrate their ideas</li> <li>• included relevant visuals</li> <li>• used geographic terminology</li> <li>• wrote clearly and with logic</li> <li>• analysed and synthesised the information.</li> </ul>
<b>Other candidates</b>	<p>Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• made inaccurate generalisations</li> <li>• included irrelevant and poorly drawn visuals</li> <li>• did not complete all questions</li> <li>• copied large sections of the resource booklet</li> <li>• did not respond specifically to the questions, and in some instances, did not address all parts of the question</li> <li>• showed a lack of understanding of the command words – discuss, justify and critically analyse</li> <li>• failed to refer to perspectives</li> <li>• wrote information that did not relate to the question</li> <li>• responses were geographically incorrect.</li> </ul>
<b>Standard specific comments</b>	<p>Successful candidates brought information into the examination with them and used these case studies effectively to illustrate their ideas.</p> <p>They made good use of visuals that enhanced their answers.</p> <p>Candidates should be aware of the differences between perspectives and points of view.</p>