



New Zealand Qualifications Authority
Mana Tohu Matauranga O Aotearoa

Home > Qualifications and standards > Awards > New Zealand Scholarship > Scholarship subjects > German > German Assessment Report

Assessment Report

New Zealand Scholarship German 2016

Standard 93006

Part A: Commentary

The top performing candidate produced responses that demonstrated almost seamless integration of evidence showing understanding of the texts, interwoven with personal responses to the texts; they evaluated viewpoints and used quite sophisticated language and an elevated style that was engaging, maintaining a level of formality without being overly academic.

High performing candidates produced effective synthesis of ideas from the texts and introduced relevant real-life examples as evidence of independent evaluative thinking. They effectively set the ideas in the text against a global backdrop.

They were also able to produce responses that were insightful and showed evidence of high level interpretation of the information; their choice of language, their turns of phrase and use of idiom were particularly sophisticated. Logical presentation of ideas was demonstrated through the use of connectors (e.g., dementsprechend, außerdem, ein weiterer Grund, zusammenfassend) and mastery of more advanced tenses in verb usage (seien, bräuchten, könne).

Responses from some other candidates were given without effective justification and with little reflective comment. They focused on reporting back information from the sources, offering less evaluative comment, and without a structured or clearly set out response.

Candidates should be reminded that New Zealand Scholarship is not merely a slightly harder Level 3 examination. The presentation of well-structured convincing arguments, including effective examples, is being assessed. There is no place for casual language, wild generalisation or unsubstantiated claims.

Part B: Report on performance standard

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

- produced language that was accurate, sophisticated, concise, and stylistically well-controlled

- made excellent use of connectors throughout, which meant that the argument was clear to the reader
- showed evidence of planning and controlled structure
- used rhetorical devices to maintain interest and clarity
- picked up themes from the listening text, demonstrating clear understanding and interpretive skill. They did this without simply repeating phrases or ideas, but rather integrated the ideas with their own interpretation of the ideas
- introduced well-argued ideas that were linked to, but lay outside the immediate scope of, the stimulus material
- produced a high level of fluency in both spoken and written responses
- produced a clear focus on the theme of the writing
- captivated the reader's interest through personal references and examples
- used structural elements (paragraphing, topic sentences, examples, conjunctions) to maintain logic and flow of text.

Candidates who were awarded **Scholarship** commonly:

- maintained an effective balance between providing evidence of understanding of the texts and expressing their own ideas on the topic
- presented the information they extracted from the listening text, faithfully reporting the details with minimal commentary
- answered all parts of any given question
- evaluated key questions of the topic in a wider context by making links to current events or personal experiences
- unpacked key words in the questions, demonstrating the ability to analyse the source material, viewed through a particular lens
- engaged and maintained the interest of the reader
- demonstrated a high level of fluency, using complex language with confidence.

Other candidates commonly:

- limited their response to reproducing or rephrasing the information in the stimulus materials, without going beyond the texts
- made sweeping statements or claims that were not supported by evidence or examples
- answered only some parts of the question, neglecting to provide a complete response
- produced German that was at times unclear, ambiguous or misleading
- wrote in a wordy fashion, often with excessive repetition, producing quantity rather than quality
- used a limited range of language structures and vocabulary, or were repetitive in their language use
- showed moments of insight or competency, but were inconsistent
- resorted to translation when including details from the text.

[Subject page](#)

Copyright © New Zealand Qualifications Authority