2022 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject: **French**

Level: **3**

Standards: **91543, 91546**

Part A: Commentary

The texts covered a variety of different aspects of French culture and life that were interesting and relevant, and included varying perspectives. The texts required candidates to engage with nuance of language to reach higher levels of achievement, but were still accessible to all candidates since texts contained both basic information and more complex language. The images provided for each question were useful in providing context to the texts.

Part B: Report on Standard

91543 Demonstrate understanding of a variety of extended spoken French texts

Examination

The assessment comprised three questions with passages of equal length and different formats (a radio report, a news report, and a podcast). The questions contained two parts. The first part of the questions invited candidates to engage with the content of the text (explain / describe), whereas the second part of the questions allowed candidates to delve deeper into the passage, asking them to evaluate, explain further, and consider a variety of viewpoints. The texts concerned matters of current social interest (a new initiative in a supermarket, an immigrant adopted by a couple with a bakery business, and a Netflix show set in Paris).

Observations

Candidates who submitted digital responses were able to provide clear, organised evidence. Of the paper responses, the handwriting of some candidates was at times difficult to read, and some words or key ideas were occasionally indecipherable.

Successful candidates ensured that their response focused on the detailed information in the passage, and any opinions, conclusions, or explanations were well integrated and linked closely with the information they heard. Where candidates strayed too far from the passage, much of their response was irrelevant as it did not provide evidence of understanding the language in the texts they had heard.

Candidates should consider that they are being assessed on their ability to understand spoken French. They need to ensure that they demonstrate understanding by connecting their ideas and opinions to the information heard, as well as including explanations of what they have understood.

Key items of vocabulary were commonly misheard or misunderstood, including:
- *engager* (to hire, employ) was often translated as "engaging Yaya in the bakery"

- *léger* (light), was often translated as "a leisure series"
- *jeunes* (young people) was confused with *gens* (people)
- *lent* (slow) was confused with *long* (a longer experience, rather than slower).
- *il suffit de* (it is enough to), was often translated as suffer (the students suffer living in maid's rooms)
  very few candidates understood "*dessus*" and believed that maids lived on the bottom floor, beneath their employers
- *patron* (boss), *pièce* (room) and *horaires* (hours, timetable) were not commonly understood and *ailleurs* (previously) was confused with *d'ailleurs* (moreover, what's more).

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- identified and linked key facts to demonstrate overall understanding of the content
- demonstrated understanding of some vocabulary, but linked ideas incorrectly, e.g., "he doesn't see his future in France"
- understood key facts but arrived at incorrect conclusions, e.g., "this initiative uses SBAM as a model for cashiers to follow"
- did not identify finer details, which led to some misunderstanding, e.g., "he has to wait for 3 years to get a residence permit", "they have been looking after immigrants for 20 years"
- produced an accurate response but did not support their answer with detailed information, e.g.,"the caisse bavarde is for people to chat while they shop"
- demonstrated understanding of commonly-used vocabulary items, but some confused similar-sounding words such as *jeunes / gens, lent / long*
- included details that were irrelevant and not connected to the passage.

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

- demonstrated a lack of knowledge of Level 1, 2, and 3 prescribed vocabulary lists
- produced responses that demonstrated understanding of only a few lexical items
- relied on glossed vocabulary and images to develop their response, e.g., "people can chat with the cashier and this creates loyalty"
- produced responses that contained a large amount of content that was not connected to the text, including personal opinions and ideas such as "travellers will be confused when they get to Paris and everyone is not speaking English"
- formed incorrect conclusions, e.g., "they set up an online petition for Yaya to raise money"
- relied on their own prior knowledge, e.g., "it is unrealistic because of the number of people speaking English", "it only shows the glamour and wealth of Paris"
- relied on words that sounded similar to English words (often incorrectly), e.g., *séries lègère* – a leisure series, *patronne* – patron, *motivé* – he is motivated.

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

- produced responses that included accurate, detailed information from the text
- demonstrated an understanding of most prescribed vocabulary
- identified some nuances in language such as tenses and finer details, but missed nuances in meaning such as *dès qu'ils ont un peu de temps* (they spent time with him to teach him), *il est prêt à faire des efforts* (he puts in effort)

- focused on the information in the text with some explanations
- organised their response and developed their answer
- demonstrated a firm grasp of the Level 2 French vocabulary, but occasionally confused vocabulary items, or demonstrated misunderstanding of a concept, without detracting from the overall quality of the response, e.g., "an apartment on the bottom floor", "a longer experience is proposed".

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

- displayed an in-depth knowledge of prescribed vocabulary
- were aware of different meanings of vocabulary items in different contexts, such as experience / experiment, permit / allow, stay / remain
- adapted vocabulary to the context of the text, not always translating the word literally, e.g., *passer* = to pass, but here it means to choose the cashier
- understood complex structures and interpreted them correctly, e.g., "the couple would have liked to employ Yaya"
- integrated explanations and conclusions with evidence from the text, e.g. "young people are using the chatty checkout and, since they were not the target audience, this demonstrates the widespread appeal of the initiative (and success)"
- organised responses in a logical way, e.g., "watching cliched shows can make you see things differently, especially if you are French and know the capital well", "we have the right to dream, as pointed out by …"
- supported viewpoints with evidence, e.g., "the couple are supportive and protective of Yaya as they have been fighting to secure him a residence permit for three years"
- directed the response to the question, rather than just translating the text, e.g., "they therefore have a parental bond being close and affectionate but they are also mentors as they are teaching him the art of baking"
- were articulate in expressing viewpoints, e.g., "their determination to get Yaya permission to work legally shows how much they value him and want to ensure his future with them in the bakery"
- provided clear explanations, e.g.,"the fact that Emily's apartment is described as a maid's room but is actually much bigger and nicer than a maid's room would be, is the main issue dividing viewers"
- extended information in the text with logical conclusions.

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

Examination

The examination was set at an appropriate level and the three topics chosen lent themselves well to the task of making meaning of written texts and demonstrating understanding of information and varied perspectives. All three topics were linked via a sustainability theme. The cultural elements such as metro ticket changes, a sustainable travel guide, and sustainable fashion were current themes.

Observations

All three texts presented information that included varying perspectives, particularly Questions 2 and 3. Some candidates engaged almost too well in the discussion of the topics, tending to include many of their own ideas, rather than giving evidence from the texts. Candidates should be aware that in a language examination, which is intended to evaluate their understanding of written texts, it is not necessary or advisable to write extended paragraphs discussing their own ideas. There were very few questions that were not attempted by candidates.

Candidates who choose to answer in French must ensure that they do not copy verbatim from the text. This practice does not show detailed understanding and can only be awarded a low grade at the very most (if the response also includes some of their own language). Ideas need to be understood and then reworked, paraphrased, summarised, and communicated in their own words.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- extracted key ideas from the texts and presented those in the answers, but some misunderstood figures, e.g., *100–1,000*, *un milliard* (a billion – commonly translated as a million)
- communicated some key ideas with relative clarity, made inaccurate guesses at words that looked like cognates, e.g., *disponible* (commonly translated as disposable, rather than available)
- demonstrated an understanding of basic vocabulary, but lacked precision in the details, e.g., *au moins* (commonly translated as less than, rather than at least), or demonstrated a lack of some higher-level vocabulary knowledge, e.g., *engagé, lecteur*, *lieux*, *actualiser*, *des centaines, propre*, *durable*
- translated nouns and verbs accurately, but demonstrated a lack of some grammatical knowledge, e.g., *préserver du tourisme* was often translated as "to preserve tourism", as opposed "to preserve from tourism".

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

- provided insufficient evidence of understanding the text
- used very generalised statements
- avoided the use of figures to support their arguments
- demonstrated misunderstanding of key vocabulary items, e.g., *besoin* was often avoided or inaccurately translated
- used their own ideas to discuss what they had understood from the text, almost to the exclusion of referencing ideas in the texts
- did not use visuals to aid understanding. e.g., Guide Tao Monde (*monde* related to the world, not just France).

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

- included detailed information from the texts to support their ideas and opinions
- used figures correctly, e.g., 165 thousand daily, to provide evidence supporting their ideas and opinions
- organised their responses in a logical manner
- used clear language to communicate understanding
- presented opposing perspectives well

- argued their own point of view in a convincing manner, using evidence from the text
- included their own ideas that were relevant to the issues being discussed, but did not show understanding of the underlying meaning of the texts.

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

- wrote very detailed responses
- wrote responses that closely aligned with the information in the text, rather than just detailing their own ideas
- organised their thoughts in a very clear, logical manner
- argued their personal point of view in a convincing manner
- presented differing perspectives and evaluated them thoughtfully
- demonstrated a wide and accurate knowledge of vocabulary
- noticed nuances of grammatical structures and how this affected meaning
- included finer detail
- demonstrated outstanding skills in communicating their understanding clearly
- wrote clearly and legibly.