

Assessment Report

On this page

[Level 3 French 2020](#) ▼

Level 3 French 2020

Standards [91543](#) [91546](#)

Part A: Commentary

The texts were reflective of Level 3 themes relevant to candidates and the questions provided opportunities for candidates to achieve at all levels.

Successful candidates were able to include opinions and varied perspectives, while justifying their responses with detailed reference to the texts. Candidates should ensure their responses are linked closely with the information from the texts and avoid basing their responses on existing knowledge.

Candidates should be encouraged to revise numbers and consider the logic of any responses that include numbers.

Candidates who answered in French tended not to go beyond the text or engage with the material through conclusions or explanations of implied meanings, but rather provided a reworded French version of the text.

Candidates should be encouraged to include all relevant details in their answers, using the questions as a starting point. The most successful responses demonstrated clarity of thought, clearly organised ideas, integrated evidence,

opinions and explanations of perspectives and implied meanings, as well as accurate reference to the French language.

Candidates should be encouraged to focus on conventions of the texts, such as tenses and adverbs. Incorrect references have the potential to detract from the demonstration of clear understanding.

Where time allows, candidates should proofread their responses to eliminate contradictory statements and check for logic and sense.

Part B: Report on standards

91543: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of extended spoken French texts

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- identified key facts in the texts and demonstrated general understanding of the content
- provided a logical response
- misunderstood some expressions, such as *Il y a 3 ans*, attributing a different meaning such as “he was 3 years old”, while still demonstrating overall understanding
- gave an opinion that was supported by some evidence from the text, e.g., “I think she is happy with the changes overall because ...”, “I think these challenges can be overcome because ...”
- misunderstood numbers or the context of a number, e.g. “there were 1912 ...”, not realising that this was a date
- omitted detailed information
- understood part of the message, e.g., “Footballer Luke gets paid \$530,000 but women get paid 5 times less”
- appeared to have learned only one meaning of vocabulary items such as *gagner*, which was often translated as “winning” and not “earning”, or *droit*, which was often “human rights” rather than “law”

misheard details, but still communicated the general meaning, e.g., “*on l’a mis en contact*” was often translated as “a friend contacted”, “*il a le droit d’y rester*” was often understood as “*il doit rester*”.

Candidates whose work was assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- understood isolated facts but were not able to join these together to make meaning of the passages, e.g., “Sportswomen train 20 hours a week” “Women in the Olympics win 1912 for winning”, “There’s a federation that exists to support the players”, “She has to work 18 hours a day”, “Her parents help her learn English”
- relied heavily on cognates and misinterpreted false cognates, such as *rester*, *travailler*, *journée* – translated as rest, travel and journey
- provided too little evidence to demonstrate understanding, sometimes answering only one part of the question.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- included detailed information, accurately drawn from the French
- connected ideas
- did not include explanations or conclusions
- attempted explanations that were not integrated, e.g., listing what Agathe likes and doesn’t like, followed by “so I think overall she is pleased”.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- provided detailed, accurate responses
- demonstrated that they had thoroughly understood a passage by expanding on what they had heard
- communicated implied meanings, e.g., explaining that Musadir had been lucky to be successful in his sporting career and fortunate that other people had helped him
- engaged fully with the meaning of the text, giving explanations beyond the passage, which were fully justified by the content, e.g., “since men and women surfers ride the same waves, it is only fair that they receive the same prize money”, and “Musadir has shown extreme dedication and commitment”, “obligations linked to family life – this will be more difficult to overcome as it is an intrinsic cultural issue”
- integrated their opinions and explanations, connecting ideas, and justified them with detailed reference to the texts

- demonstrated an ability to consider the content of what they had heard, and to organise their responses to fully answer the questions
- demonstrated understanding of nuances in the language.

Standard-specific comments

Candidates generally made good use of the listening boxes, often using a combination of French and English. It is important that candidates ensure that their answer contains all relevant information noted in the listening box.

Some candidates responded in French. Most of these candidates did not go beyond rephrasing what they had heard, and some wrote a dictation-style answer, writing down exactly what they had heard.

Many candidates appeared to know only one meaning of vocabulary items and this often resulted in strange responses, such as “winning a salary”, “losing time on things”, and “they battled the Black Ferns”. It is important to adapt the meaning of words according to the context.

In addition, expressions were misunderstood, e.g., *J’ai du mal* (badly, rather than she has difficulty), *Je me couche tard* (sleeps late, rather than goes to bed late), *vient de battre* (came to, rather than has just).

Numbers were problematic for many candidates, even those who otherwise demonstrated thorough understanding. Logic was not employed with responses including handball / football players earning \$53 million a game, candidates working 18 hours a day etc.

91546: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of extended written and / or visual French texts

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- chose some main points to write on and disregarded others
- showed understanding of gist of the texts without detailed information
- misunderstood some information but got other principal points correct.

Candidates whose work was assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- translated parts of text that bore no relation to each other in meaning, resulting in nonsensical responses

- built an answer around a word or expression that had been misunderstood and never returned to the meaning of the text.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- referred to the relevant detailed information
- used their own wording to explain meaning
- connected events and ideas so that they understood outcomes.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- reinterpreted information, gave details from the texts, and inferred meaning throughout their answers
- made sure to answer the questions, rather than transcribing the texts
- sought meaning and showed insight that was not immediately obvious
- related the texts to other situations without straying too far from the detailed meaning of the texts.

Standard-specific comments

Some candidates who answered in French chose to write direct chunks of text as their answer, which did not demonstrate clear understanding of the texts.

Candidates were at times distracted by their prior knowledge, for example on Greta Thunberg, and tended to make general statements (for example on Greta's influence) that were not directly related to the text. Candidates generally coped well with the requirement to compare a scenario with New Zealand, referring to the text to support their ideas on how successful the concept would be.

More complex language was correctly understood by high-calibre candidates: Greta being granted an audience with Macron, *Greta devait être reçue à sa demande*; that youth are ahead of governments, *sont en avance*, (rather than advancing on the government); and Greta stating she had not expected anything when starting out, *je ne m'attendais à rien* (often interpreted as waiting for nothing).

It is important that candidates are able to recognise nouns, adjectives, or adverbs that are constructed from verbs. The idea that part of NOUS Anti-Gaspi's philosophy was to make a person a *lutteur* was not grasped by many. Many candidates were not familiar with the time expression *être en train de* and there were many references to death trains (*est en train de mourir*). Candidates should

be aware of multiple meanings of words. Many translated *le temps* as time rather than weather in the context of the third text on cycling.

[French subject page](#)

Previous years' reports

[2019 \(PDF, 261KB\)](#) [2018 \(PDF, 149KB\)](#) [2017 \(PDF, 46KB\)](#) [2016 \(PDF, 218KB\)](#)