

Assessment Report

New Zealand Scholarship French 2019

Standard 93004

Part A

The examination prompted candidates to both interpret and extend discussion beyond the text to show evidence of independent reflection. The language in both questions was easily accessible and candidates were quite successful using the connected nature of the topics between questions.

In the oral response, agile students broadened the debate and discussed a range of new, less obvious, points. Those candidates who were used to reacting to the unexpected, such as in genuine interactions, performed better.

Part B: Report on performance standard

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

- engaged with the ideas in the texts, and showed understanding of the main ideas, the complexities, and implied meaning of the texts
- provided balanced discussion and analysis of the key points in the texts with a personal response (connected but not limited to their own experience) that demonstrated independent reflection and interpretation, and drew some form of conclusion
- made points that demonstrated original thought (perception and insight), and justified their point of view coherently, using relevant examples from the text or elsewhere; they often went beyond the obvious in their discussion
- addressed all elements of the questions and maintained focus on the question throughout their answers
- demonstrated sustained, controlled use of written and spoken language at a high level
- were confident in their use of French, but not necessarily much beyond Curriculum Level 8, and language errors that were made did not hinder communication of the message.

Candidates who were awarded **Scholarship** commonly:

- analysed and evaluated most of the main points in the texts, and made some connections beyond the stimulus material
- demonstrated perception and insight, as well as independent reflection, but not always consistently across all three questions (usually there was one question that was less well done)
- offered some discussion beyond the stimulus material that tended to be a little conventional in nature or relied on personal anecdotes and/or generalisations.
- addressed all parts of the questions, but sometimes handled one part less well than the others; overall, their answers were focused on the question, but sometimes moved into irrelevant discussion
- used written and spoken language at a generally high level, but possibly with some inconsistency across the three answers; language errors that were made did not interfere with communication of the message.

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

- produced responses that were mainly descriptive rather than analytical or evaluative, often simply translating the text rather than interpreting it
- focused sometimes on a very narrow section of the text, producing partial interpretations
- misunderstood the text or the question in their answer

- attempted to go beyond the stimulus material, but generally stayed very much in the personal zone, recounting personal anecdotes connected with the topic, rather than discussing the ideas, or relying heavily on generalisations to support their points
- used the topics of the texts as a springboard to write general essays without connecting their essays in any way to the points in the texts
- did not answer all parts of the question; for example, did not discuss the kind of person that would make an ideal candidate to work in the field, or describing various forms of science fiction but not tackling the role science fiction plays
- produced debating style of response, with highly emotive and persuasive language, coupled with sweeping generalisations or unsubstantiated claims
- struggled to express themselves to sustain their oral response once they had read their prepared material
- were unable stay on task and justify their point of view, or even communicate information beyond simple phrases
- were unable to produce a wide variety of language at the expected level (up to and including Curriculum level 8) and made errors in French that significantly hindered communication of the message throughout their responses to Questions 1 and 3
- appeared intent on form rather than content; used colloquial expressions or set of perceived high-level phrases and grammatical structures without regard to appropriateness.

[Subject page](#)

Previous years' reports

[2018 \(PDF, 98KB\)](#), [2017 \(PDF, 41KB\)](#), [2016 \(PDF, 189KB\)](#)
