



NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

Scholarship, 2005

German
93006

National Statistics

Assessment Report

German, Scholarship, 2005 93006

National Statistics

No. Scholarship Results	Results			
	Outstanding	Scholarship	Scholarship	
	No. Awards	% of L3 Cohort	No. Awards	% of L3 Cohort
21	4	1.0%	17	4.4%

Commentary

Texts for both the listening and reading questions were topical, interesting and related well to both the curriculum and to the world of a 17-year-old candidate. Many candidates misunderstood how deforestation impacted on orangutans or the rate at which the forest is disappearing.

As candidates were not provided with a context for their responses to the writing or speaking questions, many had no idea how to pitch what they had to say. Many candidates did not take the target audience into account, making it difficult for them to speak with great interest or enthusiasm. The best candidates did not need such a context.

Best-performing candidates

These candidates understood all the ideas from the stimulus text and substantially developed information from it. Importantly, they did not only report the ideas from the stimulus text, but gave a first-person account of what they had seen, experienced and felt. That was what the task required. Students who simply repeated the ideas from the listening text, even if this was done very well, without describing their experiences, what they saw and felt, and what they were going to do as a consequence, performed less well.

A wide variety of vocabulary and structures were integrated into the writing produced by these candidates and there was clearly developed argument. They understood that the purpose of their article was to spur people into action, evoking sympathy for the plight of the orangutans and giving the reader something they could do about it. Even though some very good responses lacked a clear course of action (most responses encouraged the reader to give money on the basis that money would solve all problems) they provided good argument behind this plea.

Ideas were seamlessly linked. There was a flow from experience to personal response and action taken, to draw the reader into their plan to save the orangutan.

In speaking they used their own language beyond the stimulus text and/or developed their own ideas by changing the wording and adding extra information about the iPod that was not in the text. The better responses also engaged with what the speakers said in the text and did not just repeat the opinions or take them at face value (although very few students noticed the sarcasm/irony).

The expression was mostly appropriate to the purpose/audience of the text. Because the purpose/audience was not explicitly stated, anything more lively than a disinterested monotone giving the impression that they were talking to someone ie asking rhetorical questions, giving opinions and reacting to the claims made in the text and varying intonation etc, was considered evidence of good expression. As a consequence, what they said mostly held the listener's interest. Even though there were a few errors in language, these errors did not hinder communication.

Other candidates

Candidates who lacked the ability to integrate vocabulary and structures into writing/speaking resorted to inserting chunks of learned material, often very complex structures that simply did not quite fit or make any sense eg "Von Wissenschaftlern wurde erwähnt, dass".

Even though there was evidence of idiomatic (natural) expressions, the language could not be described as idiomatic.

These candidates also failed to create interest for the listener or reader. Texts spoken/read in a disinterested monotone, or without pause for thought or emphasis as if the candidate was in a great hurry to get it over with, did not engage the listener.

Candidates commonly repeated the main points of the text without using the first person point of view required by the task. Most commonly a line or two containing what they were going to do (work in a conservation camp) and what other people should do (send copious amounts of money) were tacked on at the end. Text was generally very limited in terms of providing own ideas and own voice/response.

When speaking these candidates simply repeated the ideas in the text and their response to the more demanding questions tended to be short and limited, or contained a wish-list without much explanation.