

# **Scholarship**

## **2011 Assessment Report**

### **Geography**

## **COMMENTARY**

Candidates who scored well in this examination were good geographers, showing that they had a clear overview and understanding of the issues of the global water crisis through the resource materials provided and then selected relevant information to write a focused answer to each question in a concise and fluent manner. They were able to incorporate geographic ideas, terminology, and to generalise within answers, without making inaccurate statements.

As required by the Geography Scholarship standard, these candidates used sophisticated language, were able to critically analyse the material in the resource booklet, interpret the geographic nature of the context, and evaluate geographic perspectives.

They integrated 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. They also referred to material from outside the resource booklet to enhance their answer. This was clearly signaled in the questions.

## **SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE**

**Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:**

- planned their answers carefully, using the planning pages, to ensure a concisely written and fluent argument
- drew on topic knowledge from outside the resources, which allowed them to gain higher grades
- wrote fluently and 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
- showed insight and saw the connections and links in a complex topic
- critically evaluated, justified, and assessed in their answers
- identified relevant perspectives and discussed them
- integrated original and relevant visuals throughout the examination, which added value to their answer.

## **SCHOLARSHIP**

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

- wrote sound answers backed up with case study material
- followed the instructions carefully and were able to critically evaluate, justify, and assess as required
- included visuals in answers
- backed up statements with some evidence from the case studies in the resource booklet
- understood linkages and were able to draw conclusions.

## **OTHER CANDIDATES**

**Candidates who did NOT achieve Scholarship lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge above and, in addition, they:**

- copied large sections of information from the resource booklet rather than selecting and processing information for inclusion within an answer
- often made incorrect sweeping generalisations such as, “Africa is a country where there are relatively few showers and mechanical toilets” and “Kenya is the dirtiest country” and “moving water from rich countries to the poor countries in Africa”
- described rather than justified, critically evaluated, or assessed, as required by the questions
- did not understand or act on the command words
- made statements without any verification of evidence
- wrote answers that lacked structure and presented ideas that were jumbled and confused
- inappropriately highlighted and underlined significant parts of their scripts
- wrote bullet notes in tabular format where they intended it to be a visual
- used emotive, subjective language that distracted from the answer.