

2015 NCEA Assessment Report

French Level 2 91118, 91121

Part A: Commentary

Comment on the overall response of candidates to 2015 examinations for all achievement standards covered by this report.

The 2015 Level 2 French examinations provided rich and varied texts for candidates to demonstrate their understanding of written and spoken French.

The topics chosen for the Listening standard (91118) ranged from Dan Carter's move to play for a French rugby club, changes to French primary school timetable hours and the Diner en blanc social event. The Reading standard (91121) moved from the concept of the "Anti-café" in Paris to the well loved Tahiti Exchange and finally engaged candidates with an interview with Stromae, the Belgian singer.

The topics were appropriate to the curriculum level and to the candidates' age group. The overall paper was designed to view French language learning as something positive (sporting success, travel opportunities)

All the topics were well aligned to the standard's explanatory notes. They were on familiar matters and related to issues of personal and community interest. Candidates were able to demonstrate their understanding of the texts which used words from the NCEA Level 1 and 2 vocabulary lists. In their responses candidates were also able to express and justify their viewpoints which is a key objective for Level 7 of the Learning Languages Curriculum document.

Understanding of the vocabulary lists remains a key factor for success in the externally assessed French standards. At this level, candidates with a weaker awareness of the lists are likely to underperform in comparison with peers who have a good understanding of them. This is the case for both 91118 and 91121.

Part B: Report on standards

1. Assessment Report for 91118: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of spoken French texts on familiar matters

Achieved	Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provided some correct details in response to the question wrote some details in the listening notes boxes understood commonly used words in French included some irrelevant details in their responses.
Not Achieved	Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> left sections of questions unanswered made little use of the listening notes boxes misunderstood the entire gist of a passage had weak understanding of low level language.
Achieved with Merit	Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> showed an understanding of both text and question included details in their responses demonstrated understanding of some lower frequency words distinguished between different tenses.
Achieved with Excellence	Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> displayed the ability to take accurate notes of keypoints provided detail in all parts of their response consistently distinguished between different tenses wrote complete, concise responses to each question distinguished successfully between words with more than one meaning.

Standard specific comments	<p>Candidates responded well to all questions in the paper and did not appear to find any one question more challenging than another. Answers tended to be full and complete and showed effort was being taken with responses.</p> <p>Lower level language proved challenging for weaker candidates. For example, many candidates showed little understanding of numbers (even simple semi cognates such as million). Often, in Question 1 they wrote that Dan Carter would be earning \$1000.00 a year in France which does not make sense. In Question 2, days of the week were often misinterpreted.</p> <p>Higher level language comprehension also proved challenging. Some of the more sophisticated language features e.g. “one of the” were often ignored and tenses were often misinterpreted in responses. Some candidates completely misunderstood what was happening in the texts. For example, the “maillot bleu ciel” in the first passage became a famous rugby player named “Brussiel”.</p> <p>Candidates are reminded to proofread their answers to ensure they have written answers that make sense and are logical. It is also not necessary to repeat the same information in response to different aspects of a question.</p> <p>Careful use of the Listening Notes Boxes appears to help candidates formulate well considered responses. Stronger candidates often divided the notes box into sections and wrote well ordered notes to which they could refer after the recording had finished.</p>
-----------------------------------	---

2. Assessment Report for 91121: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of written and/or visual French text(s) on familiar matters

Achieved	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • used prior knowledge or personal opinion to expand their answers, rather than the text • missed part of the questions or misinterpreted the questions • used only part of the text to answer the question, rather than finding all the relevant information • showed global understanding of the texts despite some lexical errors.
Not Achieved	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relied heavily on cognates when writing their answers • were unfamiliar with basic vocabulary • wrote answers which contained very little valid information.
Achieved with Merit	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • wrote answers which demonstrated clear understanding of the texts but did not always address the questions • were able to draw conclusions but did not support these with detailed evidence from the text • were familiar with verb tenses and the relevant vocabulary lists • wrote in full sentences.
Achieved with Excellence	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • drew conclusions based on information gathered from relevant parts of the text • understood higher level, lower frequency words and phrases eg. “je ne supportais plus” • provided substantial detailed information to each question • always based their answers on evidence from the text.
Standard specific comments	<p>Candidates should be reminded that it is neither necessary or beneficial to rewrite the question into their responses. Space is allocated as an indication of how much a candidate may choose to write, not all lines have to be used.</p> <p>Justification of a response or drawing conclusions are often a requirement for answers at this level. Questions are thus scaffolded to include ‘explain why’ or “give reasons”. Some candidates neglected to offer this information in their response. Re-reading the question may be of assistance here.</p> <p>Sometimes examination text topics reflect units completed in classes throughout the year. While this may give candidates confidence, they are reminded not to embellish</p>

	<p>their answers with information from beyond the text in the resource booklet. For example, in the 2015 examination some candidates responded to the question on Stromae by writing at length about specific songs and his life in general. At all times, responses should be based on information generated in the text. This is the “understanding” that the wording of the standard is assessing.</p> <p>The importance of understanding the vocabulary list has already been mentioned in this report. However, candidates also need to be able to show nuanced understanding of words. For example in the 2015 examination “propre” was often translated as “proper”, “portable” was referred to as a “laptop” and “fière” was referred to as “fierce”. Candidates are reminded to beware of “faux amis” for example “chance” and “souvenirs”.</p>
--	--