

## 2025 NCEA Assessment Report

|                                 |              |
|---------------------------------|--------------|
| <b>Subject:</b>                 | French       |
| <b>Level:</b>                   | 1            |
| <b>Achievement standard(s):</b> | 91966, 91967 |

### General commentary

The assessments for both standards contained language accessible to Level One candidates. The material in the passages and texts dealt with situations familiar to candidates at this level, for example, young people's experiences and friendships. Throughout the texts, Noémie, a French girl living in New Zealand, was a consistent character and contexts included her life in both French and New Zealand towns, school subjects, activities, and outings. The comparison of Noémie's previous life in France and her life in New Zealand was an element common to both standards.

### Report on individual achievement standard(s)

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

Candidates were required to read three texts written in French and answer questions in English to demonstrate understanding. Responses could be in English or te reo Māori.

#### **Commentary**

The majority of candidates attempted all questions. The questions on each passage were of comparable difficulty, although part (a) of Question One required candidates to provide detailed information regarding what the French Club needed to do. This proved more challenging for some candidates. In part (b) of Question One, most candidates showed understanding of the outings suggested. To achieve the higher grades, information was required to support the conclusions reached about why Noémie may or may not choose a particular outing. "Friday" was frequently misinterpreted as "Wednesday" across all levels of achievement.

The misunderstanding of the structure "en train de" in Question Two led to confusion as candidates frequently referred to travelling by train, rather than communicating the idea that the group wanted to have a photo taken whilst they were eating Noémie's favourite dessert.

Successful candidates read all parts of the text, including titles of sections, which enabled them to provide all the necessary details required to demonstrate thorough understanding.

Familiarity with the vocabulary and structures on the L1 vocabulary list was an asset to those candidates who gained a higher level of achievement.

## Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- demonstrated an understanding of the text beyond cognates and glossed vocabulary
- referred to relevant ideas from the texts in their responses
- wrote short responses to address the question, or attempted to provide extra detail that was inaccurate or not related to the text.

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

- demonstrated sound understanding of the text in general
- provided finer details in their answers by recognising how intensifiers, adjectives, or frequency words affect meaning, for example, “fell often”, “fortunately it was hot that day”
- structured their response to address the questions directly
- began to draw conclusions but did not do so consistently, or did not use a sufficient range of supporting evidence from the passages.

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

- demonstrated thorough understanding of the entire text, including adverbs, intensifiers, and correct interpretation of tenses – for example, distinguishing past and future events like “Josh was on camp last week and Noémie is going next week”
- demonstrated understanding of more complex sentence structures and implied meanings, for example, “Noémie had never been camping before”, “the teacher laughed at himself when he fell in the water”, “we celebrated your birthday like we used to when you were living in France”
- answered all parts of each question with accurate and relevant detail
- evaluated the information and linked it clearly to the question to justify conclusions
- maintained precision in their interpretation of the passage with a high level of vocabulary and grammatical accuracy.

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

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

---

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

### Assessment

Candidates were required to listen to three passages in French. Candidates listened to the entire passage, then each section three more times. They then answered questions in English or te reo Māori to demonstrate understanding of the spoken French.

### Commentary

The majority of the candidates attempted most questions in this examination. Generally, they engaged more easily with the context and language in Question Two, where the conversation is based on school subjects and opinions. In the first question, most candidates identified a range of

information about the two towns, and those with higher levels of achievement included comparisons in their response, noting that Noémie and her friends would go for walks in Vieux Lyon and that both Lyon and Christchurch have a big park and river.

Candidates needed to focus on the detail in language when crafting their responses, as past and future tenses were often confused, which was an important distinction to make to demonstrate finer understanding of the passage. In some cases responses were unnecessarily long, including irrelevant information in an attempt to infer or extrapolate meaning. Successful candidates provided succinct and accurate responses.

Distinguishing between words that sounded similar was an asset to those who gained a higher level of achievement. For example, “la vie” vs “la ville”, “vieux” vs “vue”, “autour de” vs “tour”, and translating “histoire” as “story” or “history” from the context of the passage.

## Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- showed sufficient understanding of the general meaning of the passages to identify the context, audience, and purpose of the texts
- wrote short answers and did not 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 words which appeared to be cognates but were not, and using the common meaning of words that can have multiple translations – for example, in Noémie’s dad’s voicemail message ‘toujours’ was often interpreted as “always” instead of “still”.

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

- demonstrated clear understanding of the passage 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 passage
- presented some inconsistencies in their answers, which resulted in some of the finer details being misunderstood – for example, “Josh is not creative and finds it difficult to write about history”, rather than finding it difficult to write stories in English class.

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

- demonstrated a deep understanding of the whole passage, including how adverbs, intensifiers, and grammatical features affect its deeper meaning
- responded fully to each part of the question using all relevant information from the passage
- addressed the questions directly, using fully constructed sentences that connected their ideas logically and coherently
- demonstrated unambiguous understanding of the tenses used in the passages.
- 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 passage, often focussing on the glossed words or cognates
- did not provide sufficient information in their answers in order to demonstrate understanding of the passage as a whole.