# National Certificate of Educational Achievement

# 2011 Assessment Report

# French Level 1

**90878**   **Demonstrate understanding of a variety of spoken French texts on areas of most immediate relevance**

**90881**   **Demonstrate understanding of a variety of French texts on areas of most immediate relevance**

## COMMENTARY

Candidates performed well in both the Listening and the Reading papers. Both examination papers assessed a good range of vocabulary and context that was immediately relevant to candidates. Candidates responded to more questions within the papers than has been seen in previous years, and fewer examination scripts were left blank.

Candidates with a good knowledge of the vocabulary 'Appendix' are more likely to achieve more highly in the examination because they have the tools with which to provide more thorough answers. Direct translation of lexical items is not enough to enable achievement at the higher levels. Candidates who show that they thoroughly understand what they are hearing and reading by making links and understanding inference are best placed to achieve with Excellence.

This was the first year that candidates were allowed to answer in their choice of English, French, and/or Te Reo Maori. If candidates answer in French, their responses must still show "understanding" of the texts; this was not always evident, especially if text was simply transcribed.

With more time in the examination to complete fewer standards, successful candidates were able to manage their time wisely in order to:
- read questions carefully
- write relevant detailed answers
- proofread for sense, accuracy, and completeness.

## STANDARD REPORTS

## 90878 Demonstrate understanding of a variety of spoken French texts on areas of most immediate relevance

### ACHIEVEMENT

**Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:**
- showed a basic understanding of parts of the texts
- attempted to answer each question (often only in part)
- provided brief but not detailed answers
- showed an understanding of higher frequency vocabulary
- used cognates to help understanding of passage
- confused tenses.

**NOT ACHIEVED**

**Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:**

- did not make sense of a text to get overall meaning
- attempted to answer some but not all questions, or answered only a few parts of the questions
- gave very short answers containing no detail (for example, just a single word)
- did not understand basic vocabulary such as days, months, time, colours
- made no or very little use of the listening boxes
- provided answers that did not make sense or had nothing to do with the listening text.

**ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT**

**In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:**

- understood the texts holistically
- understood more complex details and descriptions
- used language knowledge to show a deeper understanding of some parts of the texts
- provided detailed responses
- understood more complex features, eg direct object pronouns.

**ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE**

**In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:**

- demonstrated a thorough holistic understanding of the texts
- understood complex language features (such as tenses, adverbs, adjectives, direct object pronouns, demonstrative pronouns)
- understood all the details in the text, both simple and complex, as well as the main idea, and showed all these in their answers
- showed understanding of the lower frequency vocabulary in the text e.g. *en train de, donner à manger aux oiseaux*
- understood complex series of events
- gave full and detailed answers
- distinguished the correct meaning of words that can have more than one translation, e.g. g*agner*.

**OTHER COMMENTS**

Candidates coped well with the majority of language in the examination. Many were confident with their understanding of basic information such as lower order numbers, colours, days of the week, age, time, and physical description; however, they found the higher numbers difficult, eg *deux cent soixante et onze oeuvres, quarante ans.*

Language features that proved more challenging included:

- tense, for example in Question Four, candidates tended to think the concert was still going to happen in the future
- adverbs

- partitives (*du vin*)
- negative structures like *ne … jamais*
- lower frequency vocabulary such as *essayer, réussir.*

Candidates are advised to use the Listening Notes boxes to write in as the passages are read out and then spend time writing well-thought-out answers. Higher-achieving candidates organised their notes to correspond with the requirements of the question, and wrote 'headers' in the Listening Notes boxes to focus their note-taking as they listened.

Reading through answers to check they make sense is always good practice. Many candidates wrote that "Sophie likes to eat birds in the park". This is an unlikely situation that may have been picked up with attention to proofreading.

## 90881    Demonstrate understanding of a variety of French texts on areas of most immediate relevance

### ACHIEVEMENT

**Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:**
- gave information that showed they understood the main points in some parts of the text
- conveyed some relevant details, but not accurately
- understood lower-level information (e.g. numbers, clothing etc.)
- attempted most parts of questions
- produced answers that generally made sense.

### NOT ACHIEVED

**Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:**
- understood very little language in the texts
- gave very little accurate information relating to the questions and texts
- produced fragmented, isolated chunks of language
- wrote very little, or wrote answers that made almost no sense either grammatically or in context
- attempted to answer some but not all questions, or answered only a few parts of the questions
- embellished information based on their own knowledge (e.g. of cellphones or of Johnny Depp).

### ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

**In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:**
- answered each question fully
- had a good understanding of the text
- gave clear, supporting detail in their responses
- showed good knowledge of vocabulary and language features

- proofread their answers to check for unambiguity of response.

## ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

**In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:**

- gave detailed information in each question that showed a thorough understanding of all the texts
- supported their answers fully with relevant and accurate details
- selected language appropriately to provide complete and succinct responses to questions
- took time to proofread and ensure that answers were full, comprehensible, and accurate
- inferred from the text (e.g. school report said Sandrine was often late – goal must therefore be to be punctual).

## OTHER COMMENTS

Candidates who were successful in this standard were those who were most able to capably select the relevant pieces of language required to best answer the questions. For example, Question Four required a summary of the main points of the story, and Question Three had guided sections. A complete translation of the texts was not what was requested in either question and, if produced, did not allow students to achieve at the higher levels.

Adding personal opinions, as some candidates did in Question One, e.g. "The phone looks pretty old fashioned" and "I wouldn't wear green pants" is not useful unless it has been specifically asked for in the question, in which case it would need to be justified using information from the text.

Connecting ideas proved challenging, e.g. "average results, good work even if she often makes mistakes" in Question Two. Proofreading was necessary in this question; candidates who put notes about "*vie scolaire* and "*commentaires*" in the subjects table were, consequently, not able to complete comments on all subjects.

The lower frequency vocabulary was successfully decoded only by the most capable candidates, e.g. « *Johnny dit que c'est en France qu'il se sent vraiment chez lui plus qu'aux Etats-Unis où il est né* » in Question Three about Johnny Depp.