

Assessment Report

New Zealand Scholarship Japanese 2022

Standard 93002

Part A: Commentary

The examination provided opportunities for candidates to show high-level skills in Japanese. The texts were all readily accessible to those sitting NCEA Level 3. The order of texts for the reading passages challenged some candidates to link their ideas easily, as reorganising of information, priorities, and preferences was required. However, the texts themselves were at an appropriate level. As in previous years, the speaking section was demanding for all candidates, particularly those for whom Japanese is a school-learned language. The task required synthesis of information and personal response while demonstrating a degree of language fluency.

Part B: Report on performance standard

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

- fully interpreted and evaluated the stimulus material



- gave perceptive and / or insightful answers, either by their way of explanation or in the original / effective examples (links to wider society rather than personal examples)
- wrote in a sophisticated style using sustained arguments, which made for a captivating read
- used a wide range of language to give a synthesised response to all questions.

Candidates who were awarded **Scholarship** commonly:

- interpreted the stimulus material and made connections with their own ideas. However, they often did not go beyond this (for Outstanding Scholarship they needed to show perceptive and / or insightful personal opinions, but evaluating / explaining their opinions)
- assembled their ideas in a well-formatted engaging way, so it was easy to follow their ideas; particularly, they provided an introduction and conclusion
- they were precise and clear in their arguments
- showed critical thinking in the way they explained and / or built-in their examples
- used language in a flexible and natural manner in both English and Japanese.

Other candidates

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

- partially interpreted the stimulus material (this was particularly the case for the written answers)
- did not clearly show use of the texts in their oral response (e.g., used words like “environment” or “volunteering”, but did not show links to the text). While candidates were not expected to explicitly reference the text, some responses could have been given having never read / listened to the stimulus material
- only partially answered the questions, e.g., half of the question in Question 2, or only 1-2 parts of Question 3 (e.g., gave their own opinion and other perspective, but did not use the stimulus material)

- were repetitive or showed no planning, so they were not clear / precise in their arguments
 - provided translations of the texts but did not link to their own ideas or go beyond the text
 - used ineffective examples – particularly ones that did not build on the idea but just gave an example of the same thing (e.g., another example of how they volunteered, rather than linking to an organisation like the Student Volunteer Army, which brought the example to a societal rather than personal level)
 - did not use introductions / and or conclusions – particularly in the written answers
 - did not argue a point but evaluated both sides without a conclusive stance by the end of their answer(s).
-

[Subject page](#)

Previous years' reports

 [2021](#)

 [2020](#)

 [2019](#)

 [2018](#)

 [2017](#)

 [2016](#)
