

# 2024 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject: French  
Level: 1  
Achievement standard(s): 91966, 91967

## Report on individual achievement standard(s)

### Achievement standard 91966: Demonstrate understanding of written French related to everyday contexts

#### Assessment

This assessment required candidates to read three different French texts and demonstrate their understanding by providing responses to questions in English or te reo Māori. The texts were varied: exchange partners introducing themselves, an email from Tahiti, and text messages between exchange partners.

#### Commentary

The majority of candidates attempted most questions. Generally, the candidates engaged more easily with the context and language in the first question. In the second question, most candidates identified information to support why Taaroa enjoys his life and the questions he asks Ariki. Candidates with a higher level of achievement evaluated all details from the second text to support their response, including the times for the morning routine and needing to always do homework after the family meal. Higher achieving candidates also explained the purpose of Taaroa asking Ariki those questions. Grasping the directions and the details surrounding the changing emotions in the third text proved more challenging. Some candidates needed to take care with ensuring that their answers remained succinct and in line with the intent of the texts, rather than stretching to infer or extrapolate meaning from multiple elements.

Familiarity with false friends and an ability to decode words in context was an asset to those candidates who gained a higher level of achievement – for example, *lit* as a verb vs a noun, *marché* vs *marcher*, *rester* vs *se reposer*, *se promener en bateau*, *librairie*, *avoir peur* vs *pleuvoir*, and *pleurer*.

#### Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- showed sufficient understanding of the general meaning of the texts to identify the context, audience, and purpose of the texts
- provided accurate information based on the texts that demonstrated an understanding beyond cognates and glossed vocabulary
- wrote short answers and did not tend to provide extra detail, or attempted to provide extra detail that was inaccurate or not related to the text

- showed inconsistencies in parts of their answers, such as misinterpreting false friends, and not differentiating between words that look the same but have different meanings.

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

- demonstrated clear understanding of the text in general
- provided some supporting detail in their answers, which considered key grammatical and vocabulary features, for example intensifiers or frequency words
- structured their responses to address the questions directly and with supporting detail from the text
- presented some inconsistencies in their answers, which resulted in some of the finer details being misunderstood – for example, thinking that Taaroa is asking if he would like to try the dessert and he can ask his grandmother to make it, rather than asking if Ariki knows the dessert and asking his grandmother how to make it if Ariki would like to try it.

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

- demonstrated a deep understanding whole texts including how adverbs, intensifiers, and grammatical features affect its deeper meaning
- answered all parts of the questions and provided accurate and relevant detail
- evaluated a range of relevant information in the text and connected it clearly to the question
- were precise in their interpretation of the text, making no significant errors with vocabulary and grammar.

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

- provided information that was not consistent with the text
- did not provide sufficient information in their answers to demonstrate overall understanding of the text
- relied heavily on cognates to try and gain understanding of the texts.

---

## Achievement standard 91967: Demonstrate understanding of spoken French related to everyday contexts

### Assessment

This assessment required candidates to listen to three different French passages and demonstrate their understanding by providing responses to questions in English or te reo Māori. The passages were based on a voicemail message left for a friend, a teacher's announcement to a French class, and a telephone conversation between friends.

### Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- communicated the general meaning of the text, despite the answer lacking detail
- used basic inferences to make sure the responses answered the question, rather than just translating the text
- made use of cognates to put details into their answers
- omitted significant parts of the text when giving evidence
- showed understanding of low-level lexical items such as opinion verbs and common nouns

- showed some understanding of actions in the text, but often with imprecisions as to who was doing the action – for example, the man feeding the birds in the first passage and the teacher bringing supplies in the second passage
- did not demonstrate understanding temporal contexts, for example, Bboy Sami moving to France when he was 15.

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

- demonstrated clear understanding of a range of important details in the text
- answered questions with accurate supporting details from the text
- included specific evidence from the text to justify their responses
- made small mistakes with numbers and vocabulary
- omitted some information from the text, despite showing understanding of some more complex information.

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

- responded fully to each part of the question using nearly all relevant information.
- understood nuances in meaning
- included logical inferences when answering the questions
- showed understanding of more complex details, often through recognising who the subject of each clause is – for example, the friend soon arriving in New Zealand, who was feeding the birds, who needs to look at the weather forecast.

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

- wrote short responses or left sections blank – often the responses were longer at the beginning of the exam and became progressively shorter as the questions progressed
- used only the English words in the questions and titles to form their responses, particularly for questions relating to purpose – for example, “the teacher is talking to the students about what activities they will do for each type of weather, and what the students should bring”
- used cognates to make educated guesses as to the correct response, typically resulting in inaccurate statements of varying length
- did not demonstrate familiarity with vocabulary and syntax from levels 1–4 of the curriculum.