

Assessment Report

New Zealand Scholarship Geography 2020

Standard 93401

Part A: Commentary

Successful candidates were well prepared with an understanding of both the theme of climate change in a global context and the requirements of the performance standards.

These candidates effectively unpacked the resource booklet to plan their responses, took the ideas from the resources provided and integrated that with their own learning to construct their responses.

Candidates need to write convincingly and concisely. Structured essay writing is essential. Clear introductions with organised ideas and well-developed conclusions were evident in candidates who performed highly. Questions needed to be interpreted with care and approached in a systematic way. The sophistication and integration of ideas, and insightful commentary were apparent in responses that had sound essay structure.

Diagrams must be relevant and used effectively to strengthen the argument at scholarship level. Some candidates included several relevant diagrams that related well to their discussion.

In Questions Two and Three, candidates who performed highly had well-structured paragraphs that articulated perspectives with precision and clarity.

Time management skills were important, as the successful candidates planned well to complete all three questions..

Part B: Report on Performance

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

- interpreted the question with clarity
- demonstrated clear links between cultural processes
- planned their responses with precision and care
- applied a high level of geographic knowledge and skills in their responses
- wrote with clarity and sophistication demonstrating convincing communication
- demonstrated sophisticated integration of extensive specific evidence both from within and beyond the provided resources
- demonstrated perception and insight by knowing how to critically evaluate, justify and analyse
- were able to answer the question and offer alternatives that were thoughtful and well considered.
- wrote in a concise and insightful style, yet still wrote enough so depth of ideas (range), as well as detail, was achieved
- knew how to argue in their writing in a convincing and clever way
- understood what was meant by viewing an argument through perspectives
- wrote concise introductions and conclusions linked specifically to the question
- integrated quality visuals (often numerous) into their writing seamlessly and referred explicitly to them to support their responses in a balanced fashion.

Candidates who were awarded **Scholarship** commonly:

- wrote introductions that showed accurate interpretation of the question

- integrated visuals in most parts of their responses
- demonstrated an understanding of the difference between a group or individual point of view and perspectives, often using SPENT- social, political, economic, natural, technological
- integrated evidence throughout both from within and beyond the resource
- demonstrated a logical development of ideas with clarity in the responses
- used correct geographic terminology and answered in a balanced and appropriate fashion
- demonstrated the skills of critical thinking when analysing and evaluating their perspectives
- applied a high level of geographic knowledge and skills in their responses
- made good use of the key command words of the question to present focussed responses
- demonstrated the ability to show understanding of how to argue a response
- planned their answers logically that included both detail and breadth.

Candidates who were **not** awarded Scholarship commonly:

- wrote brief responses
- did not include visuals or the visuals were weak and needed integration and relevance
- often did not plan their answers
- struggled to develop a clear argument within their responses
- did not show consistent understanding of how to be critical
- were unable to critically analyse or evaluate
- wrote irrelevant information
- did not refer explicitly to the resource materials to support their knowledge
- did not understand how to argue through perspectives
- lacked convincing fluency of writing
- copied the visuals straight from the resources

- did not create structured paragraphs.
-

[Geography subject page](#)

Previous years' reports

[2019 \(PDF, 175KB\)](#)

[2018 \(PDF, 104KB\)](#)

[2017 \(PDF, 54KB\)](#)

[2016 \(PDF, 188KB\)](#)