

Scholarship

2012 Assessment Report

French

COMMENTARY

Section One: Listen and Write:

The listening passage about poverty in France was topical and enabled candidates to use material they may have studied in class such as social issues, unemployment, and education. Candidates showed a good comprehension of the passage and were able to write extensive essays on both questions. The level of difficulty, the language used and the pace of the listening were appropriate at this level.

This question was well addressed, testing separately the listening skills in one hand and the critical thinking and writing skills on the other. The writing section required candidates to put forward opinions based on the listening given and on their own personal knowledge and experiences, which reflected their knowledge and command of French language. Knowledge and critical thinking, the ability to synthesise ideas learned in class, as well as the ability to present the content in an organised and coherent manner, were fundamental.

In this first section candidates needed to demonstrate/show:

- their listening skills and their ability to write a summary
- the ability to gather knowledge learned in class and reflect on them before answering the question.

Section Two: Read and Speak:

The Reading passage was at an appropriate level. It was on the topic of immigration and gave the candidates the possibility of using topics they may have studied in class to strengthen their speeches.

The questions asked of candidates that they demonstrate a high level of critical thinking, and the ability to synthesize their knowledge and ideas. The third question related to understanding and a fourth to a more personal response. The best candidates gave a thoughtful and balanced and personal response to the text when discussing immigration and identity.

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
- showed excellent essay writing skills: introduction, paragraphs, conclusion and summary writing
- structured their writing effectively: they wrote a thought provoking introduction, paragraphed clearly and logically, and drew a logical conclusion
- used illustrations to back up their statements including observations they made in NZ re immigration and poverty and examples from their own reading e.g. newspapers, other subjects (education, social issues such as unemployment, drugs and alcohol) and other knowledge
- had original and interesting points of view which often came from being very widely read
- had a sound knowledge of French/NZ politics regarding immigration and poverty
- were expressive in their spoken language, displayed lovely tone, gave a delivery which 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

- had 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.

SCHOLARSHIP

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

- had original and interesting points of view and developed ideas
- 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 ability to personalise and recount their own life experiences and knowledge learned in class.

OTHER CANDIDATES

Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship typically:

- did not answer questions fully or missed out a question entirely
- lacked original thought and accuracy
- made too much use of the language and ideas contained in the passage
- misinterpreted material from the listening or reading passages
- used material they had learned rather than answering the question, as written, in a balanced way.