

2015 NZ Scholarship Assessment Report

German

Part A: Commentary

Comment on the overall response of candidates to the 2015 examination.

Candidates were able to relate to the texts and offer evidence of personal connection with the themes in their answers. There was sufficient scope in the subject matter of both texts for candidates to demonstrate higher order thinking skills, critical analysis and extrapolation beyond the text to a wider context.

The standard of response produced across the cohort was generally very high in terms of quality of language. Many students demonstrated excellent understanding of the stimulus material but missed the opportunity to demonstrate critical thinking skills. The majority of candidates showed evidence of native-speaker or near native-speaker language skills.

Candidates and teachers should be reminded that Scholarship is not merely a slightly harder Level 3 exam, but rather has an important emphasis on personal response and the ability to critique and go beyond a stimulus text. The process of presenting a well-structured argument in German, including effective examples and convincing claims, is being assessed through this examination. There is no place here for casual language, wild generalisation or unsubstantiated claims. The use of cohesive devices, idiom and controlled, sophisticated language across all questions is an essential ingredient of a successful performance.

Part B: Report on performance standard

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance	<p>Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> produced language that was at once accurate, sophisticated, concise and stylistically well-controlled showed an excellent use of connectors throughout (einhergehend, deswegen, auf der anderen Seite, abschliessend) which meant that argument is 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.
Scholarship	<p>Candidates who were awarded Scholarship commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> maintained an effective balance between providing evidence of understanding of the texts and expressing their own ideas on the topic, relating either to their own experiences or to that of young people in general presented the information they extracted from the listening text, faithfully reporting the details with a minimal amount of commentary answered all parts of any given question demonstrated their ability to evaluate key questions of the topic in a wider context by making links to current events (e.g. refugee crisis) or personal experiences (homesickness, culture shock) unpacked key words in the questions, demonstrating the ability to analyse the source material 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	<p>Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 but not 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• when including details from the text, simply resorted to a translation.
-------------------------	---