

Assessment Report

New Zealand Scholarship French 2020

Standard 93004

Part A

High-achieving candidates engaged well with the ideas in the texts. They were able to both interpret and to extend their discussions beyond the texts, showing evidence of independent reflection, and resulting in insightful responses. The higher-order thinking was the most challenging aspect for many candidates. However, the language in both questions was easily accessible and candidates were able to demonstrate good use of the connected nature of topics. Strong candidates were able to broaden the debate in the oral response, where those candidates who were used to reacting to the unexpected, such as in genuine interactions, performed better.

Q1, drawn from the passage about The Great Debate, appeared to be equally managed by male and female candidates. What worked particularly well was that it clearly prompted candidates to both interpret the text and to extend the discussion beyond the text to show evidence of independent thinking.

The text for Q2, referring to the May 1968 historical upheaval in France, was understood well by most candidates. However, some answers were underdeveloped.

In Q3, some candidates did not move beyond the obvious climate difficulties the world is facing. More successful candidates used the ideas in the texts as a springboard to show the necessary reflection and extrapolation.

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 both the main ideas, and the complexities and implied meaning of the texts
- 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 texts or elsewhere, often going beyond the obvious in their discussion
- addressed all elements of the questions, and maintained focus on the questions 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 Eight; language errors did not hinder communication of the message
- were consistent and performed at a very high level across all three questions.

Candidates who were awarded **Scholarship** commonly:

- were able to analyse and evaluate most of the main points in the texts, and show some evidence that they could make connections beyond the stimulus material
- were often able to demonstrate perception and insight, as well as independent reflection, but not always consistently across all three questions
- offered discussion beyond the stimulus material, although this was sometimes 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

- demonstrated an ability to use written and spoken language at a consistently high level, but possibly with some inconsistency across the three answers; language errors 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 a text rather than interpreting it
- focused on a very narrow section of a text
- showed that they had misunderstood the texts or the questions in their answer
- attempted to go beyond the stimulus material but 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 about climate change or 'the Boomers', without connecting their essays to the points in the texts in any way
- did not answer all parts of the question, e.g., in Q1, candidates did not discuss if they agreed / disagreed with the speakers or whether they would take part in the debate. Q2, described the 1968 revolution and the way young people live now, but did not contrast the two or discuss whether they agreed or not with the author
- did not stay on track in the oral task and justify their point of view after they had read out their prepared material
- were unable to produce a wide variety of language at the expected level
- made errors in French that significantly hindered communication of the message throughout their responses to Q1 and Q3.

[Subject page](#)

Previous years' reports

[2019 \(PDF, 169KB\)](#) [2018 \(PDF, 98KB\)](#) [2017 \(PDF, 41KB\)](#) [2016 \(PDF, 189KB\)](#)

Copyright © New Zealand Qualifications Authority