

Assessment Report

New Zealand Scholarship Japanese 2024

Performance standard 93002

General commentary

Candidates who gained scholarship showed a high level of ability to analyse written or spoken text and produce a developed response. They were able to reflect on cultural differences between pet ownership in Aotearoa New Zealand and Japan, and how people in those societies relate to/think about animals. Even those candidates who do not have a pet were able to talk about friends and whānau who do, and were able to use those experiences to develop ideas from the texts. Candidates structured their responses and were able to sustain written and spoken answers using CL8/NCEA Level 3 language and kanji in an engaging manner.

Report on performance standard

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

- showed depth of understanding of the text by developing a broad range of ideas on the issue of humans' relationships with animals
- integrated their personal experiences and ideas, to build on content from the text
- had deeper discussion and gave the question global thought
- used language accurately and flexibly to develop ideas
- used language consistently across questions
- structured their argument well to create clear points.

Candidates who were awarded **Scholarship** commonly:

- showed understanding of the text by developing different perspectives and explaining different ways to view the problem
- developed a clear argument backed up by examples from the texts
- structured their answers using an introduction and conclusion
- used language in an accurate and engaging way.

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

- had frequent grammar, kanji, or spelling errors which impacted understanding
- wrote/spoke in an overly casual manner which was not appropriate for the context
- wrote responses which were too brief, or spoke for less than half the allocated speaking time
- referred only to the stimulus material and did not explore their own ideas or different perspectives
- referred to their own ideas and did not link them to the stimulus material
- misunderstood some sections of the stimulus material and/or the question.