

Assessment Report

New Zealand Scholarship Japanese 2021

Standard 93002

Part A: Commentary

Candidates who gained Scholarship showed a high level of ability to critically analyse text and produce a written or spoken response. They directly answered the questions and provided their own original examples to further develop their answers. Those who gained Outstanding Performance were able to do this consistently across both languages and to do it with flair, providing complex, effective examples to fully explain their answers. An ability to interpret text and provide independent, original ideas was important. Candidates gained Scholarship when they planned their work and wrote precise and clear answers. Candidates did not need to use large numbers of Kanji, nor did they need to use Kanji beyond what is expected at CL8/NCEA Level 3.

Part B: Report on performance standard

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

- showed very high levels of analysis and critical thinking
- referenced the texts clearly
- provided original ideas which linked into ideas in the texts
- provided original, effective examples which clearly linked to the stimulus material and the questions
- fully interpreted the stimulus material and demonstrated independent reflection
- planned their essay and spoken presentation so the ideas were concise and flowed well
- spoke / wrote in a captivating way.

Candidates who were awarded **Scholarship** commonly:

- showed high levels of analysis and critical thinking
- utilised the texts to create an argument that answered the questions
- referenced the texts but did not fully interpret their meaning
- used effective examples to back up their answers, which were evaluated
- integrated their own ideas, which went beyond the stimulus material
- directly answered all the questions
- worked consistently in both written and spoken Japanese.

Other candidates

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

- demonstrated some independent thinking
- answered parts, but not all, of the questions
- did not reference the stimulus materials
- interpreted the stimulus material inconsistently



- evaluated both sides of an argument but did not come to a firm conclusion about their point of view.

[Subject page](#)

Previous years' reports

[2016 \(PDF, 187KB\)](#)

[2017 \(PDF, 46KB\)](#)

[2018 \(PDF, 90KB\)](#)

[2019 \(PDF, 184KB\)](#)

[2020 \(PDF, 105KB\)](#)
