

2025 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	French
Level:	2
Achievement standard(s):	91118, 91121

General commentary

The 2025 external examinations for Level 2 French provided candidates with sound opportunities to achieve at all levels across a variety of appropriate linguistic and cultural contexts related to the French speaking world. Both standards assessed a wide variety of grammatical structures up to and including Level 7 of the New Zealand Curriculum and all texts were based on the recently revised vocabulary lists for NCEA Levels 1 and 2. Words outside of these lists were glossed for candidates when their meaning was not evident from the text.

These examinations assessed understanding of the texts and their implied meanings and conclusions. Some candidates included personal opinion, experience, prior knowledge, and thoughts tangential to the general theme of the questions. These details often led to long, unstructured answers that strayed too far from the texts. Candidates who presented the main ideas of the passage first and supported them with specific evidence, justifications, and inferences drawn from the passage achieved at a higher level.

Candidates who achieved at a high level demonstrated thorough understanding across all questions in a standard. This understanding went further than simply translating text and was exemplified through accurate, relevant conclusions being drawn from the texts. These candidates also showed unambiguous understanding of the complete texts and communicated this in their responses by using clear language without repetition of ideas, direct translation, or excessive personal opinion.

There was increased use of phrases such as “this shows that” and “from the text we can infer that”. While these are powerful structures to make conclusions and justify statements, they were sometimes overused, with some candidates using them following almost every sentence they wrote.

Numbers were poorly understood by candidates working at all levels of achievement and this was also observed in 2024.

Candidates who choose to respond in French must show comprehension of the text. Repeating the correct part of the text in French and not answering the question does not show understanding of the text.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

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

Assessment

The examination was based on three texts covering a range of text types: a French music competition, a podcast from a teenager who had stopped using his mobile phone, and an interview

about the popularity of football for women in New Zealand. These were engaging, relevant, and accessible to candidates.

In Question One, *La Manie Musicale*, candidates were required to answer on what the competition looked like in the classroom and the benefits of this competition for students and teachers.

In Question Two, *Au revoir portable*, candidates answered on the change the teen had experienced by going “phone free” and the impact this has had on his life.

In Question Three, *Le nouveau sport national kiwi ?*, candidates provided information on the popularity of football in New Zealand and how the student being interviewed sees the future of her team progressing.

Commentary

Overall, candidates responded well to the examination. Question One was handled well by candidates. Question Two was a very familiar context for candidates. Question Three proved the most challenging.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- showed some understanding of the passages
- supported answers with valid points from each passage
- recognised main ideas from the texts, for example, (in Question Two) “he’ll never go back to his old life”
- elaborated on information by sharing examples from their personal life, which was not always relevant to the topic, instead of using examples from the texts
- demonstrated familiarity with widely-used vocabulary and grammar used at this level
- misunderstood numbers.

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

- showed a good understanding of the passages overall
- identified key points from the passage that used a higher level of language and grammatical complexity
- answered the questions clearly and provided ideas which were well supported by the texts, for example, (in Question One) “they communicate with other high schools”, and (in Question Two) “by chance he was reading an article by a woman who gave up her smartphone”
- recognised key grammatical points and showed a solid grasp of vocabulary.

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

- effectively answered questions in detail, providing precise and thorough responses
- included relevant supporting details to fully justify conclusions
- answered clearly, logically presenting the information from the passages
- inferred meaning and understood underlying subtleties within the questions, for example, (in Question One) “students enjoy discovering artists from all over as these are songs from the French speaking world, while having fun”
- analysed the context and drew logical connections to craft comprehensive responses that demonstrated depth of understanding and a strong command of the language at this level.

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

- did not demonstrate understanding of relevant information, ideas, and / or opinions within the passages

- communicated minimal information from the passages
 - wrote responses based on the theme of the passages without connecting it to the actual text
 - demonstrated insufficient knowledge of grammar and vocabulary at this level.
-

Achievement standard 91121: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of written and/or visual French text(s) on familiar matters

Assessment

The examination was based on three texts covering a range of text types: an article on the threat of cats in New Zealand, a letter between penfriends planning to meet, and an interview with Tahitian sisters who have succeeded at university in New Zealand. The texts covered social and environmental issues, friendship, employment, education, Pacific nations, wellbeing, and New Zealand as a broad range of themes.

In Question One: *Le dilemme du chat*, candidates were required to answer on cat ownership in New Zealand and the threat cats pose.

In Question Two, *Un boulot pour toi*, candidates had to comment on why Guillaume should come to New Zealand and the skills he could bring to a job here over the summer.

In Question Three, *Deux sœurs tahitiennes*, candidates provided information on the importance of New Zealand for the sisters and how their journey to success may inspire others.

Commentary

Candidates responded well to the three questions overall. In Question One, some candidates went well beyond the text in their responses, drawing on prior knowledge about New Zealand's fauna and flora, ecosystems, and stories about their own pets. This type of information does not support understanding of the text and should not be included in responses. A lack of familiarity with numbers was particularly noticeable in this question. 200,000 (the approximate number of cats in New Zealand) was regularly understood as 2000, 2,000,000 or 20,000,000. 100 (years) was often understood as 10 or 5. This is a case where proofreading for common sense is recommended – it is unlikely that there will be millions of cats in a country of approximately 5 million people. “Au moins”, “personnes âgées”, “sensible”, “bruit”, “colère”, “avertissement”, “en ont un eux-mêmes”, and “s’ occuper” were generally not well understood.

Question Two and Question Three were relatively well answered, but candidates tended to miss out important details in their responses to each of these questions. Candidates are encouraged to consider the entire text when responding to each section of the question.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- showed a basic understanding of the gist of each text
- showed understanding of phrases of each text
- used cognates and high-frequency words to understand the gist
- wrote shorter responses that lacked useful evidence from the passage
- included substantial personal opinion / prior knowledge of a topic in their response that went beyond the text
- repeated themselves substantially within their answers
- included inaccuracies or misunderstandings throughout their response.

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

- showed clear understanding of each text
- included relevant detail in their response and attempted to draw links and conclusions
- included some personal opinion or prior knowledge of a topic in their response that went beyond the text
- showed good overall understanding of the text, but missed some key details or misunderstood vocabulary items, for example, “nous sommes nées”, “nous manque trop” and “le plus tôt possible” in Question Three, or providing numbers that made their response to Question One illogical.

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

- selected appropriate information and details from the text to answer the question
- showed accurate comprehension of the text at both global and lexical level
- translated “false friends” such as “se passer” and “sensible” accurately
- conveyed understanding of more complex language, structure, and ideas in the texts, for example, “la plupart des gens qui veulent contrôler les chats en ont un eux-mêmes” and “C’est mieux de les faire le plus tôt possible”
- wrote clear and succinct answers that thoroughly responded to each question
- included inference that was linked to the text and enhanced the quality of their answer, for example (in Question Three) “the sisters could inspire Pasifika women to go into engineering, where they are traditionally underrepresented”.

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

- gave short responses, or wrote repetitive sentences that contained very little information
- misunderstood the text and / or the question
- answered only one of the three questions
- identified cognates or semi cognates and formed a response based heavily around those words
- included substantial extraneous personal opinion or prior knowledge that was not from the text itself
- did not show understanding of vocabulary and grammatical items common at this level.