

Assessment Report

New Zealand Scholarship Geography 2025

Performance standard 93401

General commentary

Successful candidates argued their stance using multiple perspectives, as required in Question Two, often applying social, economic, and environmental lenses. The integration of original or adapted visuals was required across all three questions. High-performing candidates included diagrams and referred to them explicitly to enhance their responses. Incorporating sufficient evidence from the resource booklet was essential. Overall, the quality of responses was high. Successful candidates demonstrated strong geographic knowledge and skills, sophisticated literacy, effective time management (completing all three questions), critical thinking, and a sound conceptual understanding of the theme.

Report on performance standard

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

- demonstrated sophisticated literacy skills
- used a high level of geographic knowledge consistently across responses
- applied multiple perspectives effectively
- presented a balanced and convincing argument
- demonstrated clear, concise, and critical thinking
- showed perception and insight through evaluation, discussion, justification, and analysis
- synthesised and extrapolated material from the resource booklet and integrated relevant external evidence
- showed sophistication in argument through effective connection, integration, and abstraction of ideas
- integrated high-quality original visuals and referred to them explicitly to support responses.

Candidates who were awarded **Scholarship** commonly:

- demonstrated strong literacy skills with clear, concise, and fluent writing
- planned and structured responses logically, with coherent flow
- addressed all parts of the question explicitly
- applied key command words accurately
- argued a clear stance from the outset and sustained it throughout
- used appropriate and precise geographic terminology
- applied a high level of geographic knowledge and understanding
- synthesised material from the resource booklet effectively
- integrated specific evidence from provided resources and beyond
- demonstrated critical thinking through analysis, evaluation, discussion, and justification

- incorporated and critically evaluated multiple perspectives
- integrated original or adapted visuals effectively to enhance the response.

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

- demonstrated limited evidence of planning
- produced brief and poorly structured responses
- did not develop or sustain a clear argument
- demonstrated limited critical understanding
- omitted required perspectives
- showed limited depth and breadth of understanding
- did not use the resource booklet to support responses with evidence
- copied visuals or material directly from the resource booklet without adaptation
- provided no visuals, or used weak visuals that were poorly integrated.