

# **Scholarship**

## **2011 Assessment Report**

### **French**

## **COMMENTARY**

### **Listening/Writing**

The Listening passage about mobile phones was topical and allowed students to use material about the extensive use of mobile phones and the consequences and other problems introduced by the use of technology that they may have studied in class. The students showed good comprehension of the passage and were able to write extensive essays on both of the questions.

The Writing question was well addressed, testing separately the listening skills on one hand and the critical thinking on the other. The intent of the writing question was to enable candidates to put forward opinions, based on the listening given and their own personal knowledge and experiences, so showcasing their knowledge and command of the French language. This knowledge, as well as the ability to present the content in an organised and coherent manner, was fundamental.

In the first part, candidates needed to demonstrate/show their listening skills and their ability to write a summary. Some candidates did not include key points of the listening and/or gave their opinions without referring to the content of the listening passage at any time.

### **Reading/Speaking**

The Reading passage was at an appropriate level. The topic of extreme sports, and planking in particular, allowed candidates to address topics that they may have studied during the year such as sports and personality, or lifestyle. The first question was more straightforward and related to understanding; the second question required a more personal response. This gave candidates the opportunity to move above Curriculum Level 8 and include a very wide range of material and ideas. The highest-achieving candidates gave a thoughtful and balanced and personal response to the text when discussing extreme sports and their dangers in New Zealand.

## **SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE**

### **Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:**

- had an extremely wide range of language, many beyond level 8 of curriculum
- had excellent essay writing skills, structuring their writing effectively: thought-provoking introduction, clearly paragraphed, and logical conclusion
- used examples to back up their statements including incidents from their own lives and examples from their own reading e.g. newspapers, other subjects (sports and personality, diets, lifestyles), and general knowledge of extreme sports such as planking and gliding in New Zealand
- showed original and interesting points of view that often came from being very widely read
- had a wide knowledge of French/New Zealand extreme sports

- were expressive in their spoken language and tone, gave a delivery that was immediate rather than simply reading from their notes, used language features such as rhetorical questions as well as humorous anecdotes from their own experience – and in this way were able to hold the interest and at times captivate their audience
- answered using a logical flow and gave equal importance to both questions
- used idiomatic language and complex structures to express their points of view
- made their answers personal by referring to their own lives and experiences
- showed excellent essay-writing skills: introduction, paragraphs, conclusion, and summary writing.

## **SCHOLARSHIP**

### **Candidates who were awarded Scholarship but not Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:**

- had original and interesting points of view
- used some idiomatic language and complex structures (e.g. subordinates, use of tenses such as subjunctive, conditional) to express their points of view
- demonstrated accuracy in the use of most grammar structures
- showed ability to express a point of view, a personal reaction, reflection or comment with some confidence
- used sequences and paragraphs to make their points clearly
- showed ability to pick up, refer back to, and discuss important points in the text
- developed ideas
- showed an ability to personalise and recount their own life experiences.

## **OTHER CANDIDATES**

### **Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship typically:**

- did not answer questions fully or missed out a question entirely
- made unnecessarily high use of the language and ideas contained in the passage
- showed evidence of having misinterpreted material from the listening or reading passages
- did not structure their written responses by having an introduction, paragraphing, and a conclusion
- stressed material they had learned rather than answering the question in a more balanced way
- showed little or no original thought
- were inaccurate in their use of vocabulary and structures.