

Assessment Report

New Zealand Scholarship Geography 2024

Performance standard 93401

General commentary

Many candidates showed a strong ability to support their opinions by looking at different perspectives, such as social, political, feminist, economic, and environmental views. Many also used creative visuals (often several per question) to strengthen their answers. Some candidates included outside knowledge and evidence but didn't refer to the resource booklet enough. It is important to use plenty of evidence from the booklet to back up ideas. Overall, the responses were well-written and showed great geography skills, knowledge, critical thinking, and understanding of key concepts.

Report on performance standard

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

- included clear planning and interpreted the question effectively
- demonstrated sophisticated literacy skills (e.g., wrote precise introductions and conclusions specifically addressing the question; using effective and appropriate paragraphing)
- integrated original and well-executed visuals into their answers, using them explicitly to support balanced and structured arguments
- integrated synthesised and abstracted material from the resource booklet and beyond to shape their arguments
- shaped their responses around the resources while still showing insight and understanding (specifically, through the interconnectedness of factors whilst still evaluating these)
- demonstrated sophistication in their argument, making connections within their arguments
- communicated and used perspectives within their arguments
- engaged in clear, concise critical thinking and evaluation, discussion, justification, and analysis
- applied a high level of geographic knowledge and skills in their responses.

Candidates who were awarded **Scholarship** commonly:

- planned and structured responses logically, arguing their stance from the outset in most cases
- demonstrated effective literacy skills
- demonstrated understanding of the key command words of the questions, through explicitly addressing them
- integrated original visuals throughout their responses, enhancing their arguments
- communicated perspectives
- used appropriate geographic terminology
- integrated specific evidence to support their arguments throughout, both from within the resource provided and beyond
- demonstrated critical, analytical, evaluative, discussion and justification skills
- applied a high level of geographic knowledge in their responses.

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

- showed no evident planning
- had no clear strategic approach
- misunderstood the requirements of the questions
- answered only one or two questions (time-management)
- did not develop a clear or critical argument
- lacked depth and breadth
- had no visuals or the visuals were weak and not integrated
- did not integrate perspectives into their arguments
- did not support their ideas and/or visuals with evidence from the resource book, or copied these directly from the resource booklet, without showing any analysis or critical thinking
- did not evaluate or provide an argument for most significant factors/implications.