

Assessment Report

New Zealand Scholarship Japanese 2016

Standard 93002

Part A: Commentary

Candidates are required to interpret the stimulus material and make connections with their own ideas that go beyond the given material. This key component was often missed or referred to only very briefly.

Many candidates provided a descriptive rather than an analytical response. Their essays showed a sound understanding of the text but did not interpret the material to make connections with their own ideas that go beyond the given material.

Many candidates who gave their thoughts, did not provide supporting evidence. In question 2, the English essay, some candidates wrote without any reference at all to the stimulus material and therefore did not demonstrate understanding.

Some candidates took a long time to articulate their point(s) and the level of clarity of ideas was not consistent throughout their responses, particularly in question 3, the speaking part of this assessment.

Part B: Report on performance standard

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

- exhibited perceptive and insightful ideas that were fully integrated into their response. The stimulus material was fully interpreted and frequently referred back to.

Candidates who were awarded **Scholarship** commonly:

- ensured that they addressed the question and did this in a succinct manner
- showed independent thinking and reflection, while making connections back to the text.

Other candidates commonly:

- did not understand the questions and what the response required
- did not answer parts of the question
- wrote a lot of content which was a summary of what they heard or read
- did not interpret the stimulus material.

Further comments

In question 1, there were two parts to the question. Some candidates focused only on the first part of the question, which asked them to explain differences. The second part of the question, 'What do you think will happen in the future?' was a key component that was missed or only referred to in one line.

In question 2, the English essay was not a translation exercise; it looked at how well the candidate interpreted the stimulus material. Some candidates wrote essays based entirely on a personal response to the question with no reference to the passage.

Candidates have to demonstrate an understanding of the text and justify their argument(s). Candidates also need to be more concise. Personal opinions and anecdotes need to have direct correlation to the text and the question, as some candidates got carried away with wanting to fill the space rather than focusing on the ideas.

In question 3, the speeches often came across as a stream of consciousness rather than a spoken response which required the expression of ideas with precision and clarity. Candidates only have 10 minutes to prepare so it is advisable to focus on a few points as examples and develop these, rather than give many examples without much evidence and personal response and thus avoid repetition of

[Subject page](#)

Copyright © New Zealand Qualifications Authority