

Assessment Report

New Zealand Scholarship French 2025

Performance standard 93004

General commentary

Candidates engaged with the theme of the exam well. The questions flowed and candidates responded with reference to the stimulus material, as well as bringing in their own knowledge.

Question One, about what it means to be an artist, prompted candidates to reflect critically on the material. Strong candidates raised excellent points.

Question Two, about whether we are all artists, prompted reflection on the material alongside personal opinion and experiences. Scholarship candidates synthesised these well with the stimulus material, and drew conclusions, made insightful suggestions, and raised thought-provoking questions.

Question Three, about the purpose of art, prompted further reflection.

Strong candidates referenced all stimulus material in their responses. Some did not do this, even though the speaking card gave this instruction.

Command and accuracy in written French, as well as fluency and accuracy in spoken French, were key for distinguishing Scholarship candidates. Quality of essay writing also distinguished these candidates. Those not working at Scholarship level produced a descriptive response, lacking evidence of critical thinking and opinion, while those at Scholarship level had synthesised responses that intertwined personal opinions with ideas, opinions, and evidence from the stimulus material.

Report on performance standard

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

- demonstrated sophistication in their use of French, leaving you wanting more
- gave balanced responses, blending personal opinions with the negative and positive points
- demonstrated consistency in language level and used a very wide range of complex structures
- interpreted the stimulus material fully
- explored ideas beyond the stimulus material, showing evidence of critical and independent thinking
- wrote in sophisticated, highly synthesised French, using a very wide range of vocabulary – errors were minimal and did not hinder comprehension or the fluency of their response to Question One
- referred to the stimulus material of each question, including the quote supplied in the speaking section, in their spoken response to Question Three.

Candidates who were awarded **Scholarship** commonly:

- integrated personal opinions and ideas and blended these with points raised in the stimulus material

- demonstrated consistent French language skills up to and including Curriculum level 8 – any errors were minor and did not distract from a fluid response
- demonstrated high-level analysis and critical thinking
- had confident writer’s voice and style, with a strong beginning and end.

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

- did not show knowledge of French at Curriculum Level 8
- had many basic errors in their French, such as verb conjugations, plural agreements of adjectives, *à + le / la / les*, and phonetic spelling
- delivered a speech that was short or hesitant – some candidates did not fully answer the question; others failed to reference Question One and / or Question Two
- 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 essay responses
- did not show understanding of the stimulus material.