# 2022 NCEA Assessment Report

**Subject: French**

**Level: 2**

**Standards: 91118, 91121**

## Part A: Commentary

The examination required candidates to listen to and read texts in French and to respond to questions showing in-depth understanding through thorough analysis and interpretation of information, concepts, and opinions.

Candidates who were successful had a very good level of understanding and knowledge of French Level 2 vocabulary, idioms, and grammatical structures. They were able to justify their answers in detail and demonstrated an understanding of implied meaning and drew meaningful conclusions.

A few candidates were unable to get the gist of the texts and did not draw their evidence from the texts.

Both standards had relevant topics and the vocabulary used through each passage was at the correct level. However, candidates found one text more challenging in each standard.

## Part B: Report on standards

91118: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of spoken French texts on familiar matters

## Examination

The examination covered three listening texts with questions relating to each of them. The questions allowed for differentiation of candidate responses.

Question 1 was a conversation – it required candidates to consider the opinions of two backpackers sharing opinions on travelling New Zealand in a van. They needed to consider the advantages, disadvantages, and risks of living and travelling in a van in New Zealand.

Question 2 referred to a conversation between a student and a Career Counsellor discussing a summer job opportunity at a summer camp. The first part required candidates to evaluate the opportunities that the summer camp offered to young people. In the second part, the candidates needed to understand that the prospect of working at the summer camp came with some reservations.

Question 3 was a podcast about a famous choreographer, Saddeck Waff, who contributed to the last Olympic Games. Although the topic was relevant and the vocabulary used was at the correct level, candidates found it more challenging to connect to the text.

**Observations**

Candidates succeeded when they were able to decipher different contexts and analyse and compare these adequately. In the first text, many candidates did not fully develop their answers whilst talking about the pros and cons of travelling in a van in different seasons (summer and winter). In the second text, some candidates did not perceive Arthur's weaknesses and the reason he needed reassurance. Being aware of subtle hints allowed candidates to analyse Arthur's character and his thoughts. In the third text, candidates made assumptions that all dancers were disabled, even Saddeck Waff, and missed out on the fact that they were of different genders and abilities.

**Grade awarding**

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- answered most parts of every question
- included some incorrect information
- demonstrated a sense of general meaning
- had short, juxtaposed sentences and ideas and did not justify their answers.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- lacked vocabulary and developed an incorrect interpretation of the texts
- only understood a few parts of the passage, which was insufficient to convey the general meaning
- relied on the introduction, glossary, and pictures to show their understanding.

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

- understood the general meaning of the passage clearly
- provided detailed answers with good examples and supporting evidence, but did not always justify their answers
- mentioned some Excellence points, but with inconsistencies and / or incorrect facts.

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

- justified their answers fully with precise wording and specific details showing understanding of the texts
- demonstrated a thorough understanding of the passage
- used supporting evidence from the passage to justify their answers
- made valid inferences expanding on the lexical translation.

**91121: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of written and/or visual French texts on familiar matters**

**Examination**

The examination covered three reading texts with questions relating to each of them. The questions allowed for differentiation of candidate responses.

The questions invited candidates to show understanding by selecting, explaining, and making links to facts and opinions, using supporting details from the texts.

Question 1 is focused on an article in a sport magazine about Pétanque. The first part of the text needed candidates to understand why players are disappointed that Pétanque is not part of the 2024 Olympic Games in Paris. The second part required candidates to state the advantages of the sport.

Question 2 invited candidates to determine whether being a drone pilot is the job of the future. Although it is a popular and valuable job, it has many challenges.

Question 3 related to the vaping issues of an adolescent, who is considering whether she should tell her parents or not. The response involved her personal thoughts on her relationship between herself and parents and her friend's opinions.

**Observations**

Most candidates were familiar with the topics in the first and the second text. However, candidates who achieved at a lower level often included guesses, personal knowledge, and opinions. rather than answers based on the texts. Candidates who achieved with Excellence succeeded in answering questions without being limited by them. They expanded their answers using relevant elements from the texts.

Vocabulary that was commonly misunderstood or ignored included  *puisque, non plus, cent, pourcent, s'occuper de, le plein air, exclusivement, travailler, la météo, casser, attirer, avertir, il y a… que, par cœur,* and *parler de.*
Candidates must be reminded to read both questions before starting their answer, as many ended up repeating the material.

**Grade awarding**

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:
- showed an overall basic understanding of the text
- identified the main points in the texts, but could not supply supporting details
- demonstrated understanding of the text in their answers, but could not support those answers due to lack of mastery of basic language such as numbers, prepositions, and verb tenses.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- did not answer all questions or gave little information
- included irrelevant details not from the texts
- provided literal translations that were unclear
- failed to understand the overall meaning
- used blanks in the middle of an answer or a French word when understanding was unclear.

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

- provided very detailed answers, but failed to express any underlying meanings
- had a good understanding of the texts and of the language structures
- used clear and unambiguous language.

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

- provided most relevant details and supported answers well with reference to the texts
- showed thorough understanding by taking the subtlety of tenses, vocabulary, and idioms into account
- communicated underlying meanings that were relevant to the texts
- explained how different ideas or pieces of information were linked to provide further meaning.