

Assessment Report

New Zealand Scholarship French 2021

Standard 93004

Part A

High-achieving candidates engaged well with the theme across the paper, as well as the stimulus material. They were able to interpret and extend their discussions beyond the text, thus showing evidence of independent reflection, resulting in insightful responses. Higher-order thinking was the most challenging for some candidates. The language was easily accessible, and candidates were able to demonstrate good use of the connected nature of the topics, particularly in the oral question.

Question one, focusing on youth and new technologies, was well managed by all candidates. It clearly prompted candidates to both interpret the stimulus material and extend their discussion beyond the text, showing evidence of independent thinking.

Question two, with a text focused on living forever thanks to transhumanism, was understood well by the majority of candidates. The strongest responses acknowledged the current situation, bringing in personal opinions justified with strong examples. These synthesised arguments were presented in a sustained, convincing and coherent manner.

In both question one and question two, some candidates failed to develop answers fully, producing descriptive accounts of the stimulus material with little or no evidence of higher-order thinking skills.

Question three saw some candidates deliver sophisticated, highly synthesised responses while others delivered their notes before struggling to communicate coherently with partial interpretation of the stimulus material. Most candidates used ideas in the texts as a springboard to show the necessary reflection and extrapolation. However, some candidates failed to refer to both the stimulus text and listening passage, which is a requirement of the question. Others delivered their notes with flair.

Some candidates lacked clarity of ideas and often did not express themselves with cohesion, nor synthesise with opinions.

Candidates are encouraged to ensure that their handwriting is always legible. A shorter, clear essay will display better understanding than a long, illegible one.

Part B: Report on performance standard

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

- engaged consistently across the paper, integrating sophisticated personal opinions, ideas, beliefs, and viewpoints to illustrate points discussed from the stimulus
- used the stimulus wisely, fully interpreting the stimulus material and making connections with their own ideas that went beyond the given material and demonstrated independent reflection
- produced work that was very organised, synthesising each point leading to paragraph conclusion
- opened the debate bringing in new ideas, such as a dystopian risk and mental health implications in question one and financial implications, movie examples and societal issues in question two
- captivated the audience; made the marker smile
- consistently used a very wide variety of complex structures and vocabulary up to and including Curriculum Level 8 or equivalent, that was well integrated into a high-level, synthesised response.



Candidates who were awarded **Scholarship** commonly:

- understood the stimulus material and analysed and evaluated most of the key points in the texts, and showed some evidence that they could make connections beyond the stimulus material that tended to be a little conventional in nature or relied on personal anecdotes and / or generalisations
- used a wide variety of complex structures and vocabulary up to and including Curriculum Level 8 or equivalent that was well integrated into a synthesised response
- expressed ideas with precision and clarity, using clear examples from the text.

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

- demonstrated a lower level of French grammar and vocabulary
- used formulaic language, which didn't read fluently
- displayed little understanding of the texts or translated stimulus producing a descriptive, not analytical, response
- did not complete all three questions
- did not express personal ideas or opinions.

[Subject page](#)

Previous years' reports

[2020 \(PDF, 240KB\)](#)

[2019 \(PDF, 169KB\)](#)

[2018 \(PDF, 98KB\)](#)

[2017 \(PDF, 41KB\)](#)

[2016 \(PDF, 189KB\)](#)
