

## Assessment Report

# New Zealand Scholarship French 2023

## Performance standard 93004

### General commentary

Question One was on coeducational or single-sex schools, and prompted candidates to reflect critically concerning the material raised. Successful candidates raised excellent points.

Question Two, about school meritocracy, enabled candidates to identify with the question and bring in personal opinions and experiences. Scholarship candidates synthesised these well with the stimulus material, often drawing conclusions or raising further questions.

Question Three, about being a privileged or underprivileged student, prompted further reflection. Many failed to reference all the stimulus material, though the best answers did this exceptionally well. This is also relevant for Questions One and Two, as many answers were not blended with examples from the stimulus material to illustrate ideas and opinions.

It was the quality of the French that helped to distinguish Scholarship candidates. There was still a lack of higher-level language in many candidates who entered. Responses to Question One were weaker in terms of the level of language demonstrated, where phonetic spelling and a lack of verb conjugation were noted on many papers.

### Report on performance standard

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

- fully interpreted the stimulus material
- gave balanced responses, blending personal opinions with the negative and positive points
- wrote in sophisticated, highly synthesised French, using a very wide range of vocabulary with minimal errors that did not hinder comprehension or fluency
- demonstrated sophistication of French language use, leaving you wanting to read / hear more
- explored ideas beyond the stimulus material, showing evidence of critical and independent thinking
- referred to the stimulus material from Question One and Question Two in a fluid and well-constructed speech.

Candidates who were awarded **Scholarship** commonly:

- responded by integrating personal opinions and ideas with the points raised in the stimulus material
- used a wide variety of complex structures and vocabulary, up to and including Curriculum Level 8, that were well integrated into synthesised responses
- demonstrated high-level analysis and critical thinking.

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

- did not show knowledge of French at Curriculum Level 8
- had many basic errors in their French: did not conjugate verbs, plural agreements of adjectives, *à + le/la/les*, phonetic spellings
- spoke in a short or hesitant manner – some candidates did not fully answer the question, others failed to reference Question One and / or Question Two, and some delivered a very limited speech
- wrote a descriptive recount of the stimulus material with no personal opinion or further development of the ideas presented, thus showing no independent thinking
- lacked structure in their written responses
- misunderstood the stimulus material.