2022 French (continuers) Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the 2022 assessment cycle, gives an overview of how students performed in their school and external assessments in relation to the learning requirements, assessment design criteria, and performance standards set out in the relevant subject outline. They provide information and advice regarding the assessment types, the application of the performance standards in school and external assessments, and the quality of student performance.

Teachers should refer to the subject outline for specifications on content and learning requirements, and to the subject operational information for operational matters and key dates.

Across the Assessment Types for this subject, students can present their responses in oral or multimodal form, where 6 minutes is the equivalent of 1000 words. Students should not speed-up the recording of their videos excessively in an attempt to condense more content into the maximum time limit.

From 2023, if a video is flagged by markers/moderators as impacted by speed, schools will be requested to provide a transcript and markers/moderators will be advised to mark/moderate based on the evidence in the transcript, only considering evidence up to the maximum word limit.

If the speed of the recording makes the speech incomprehensible, it affects the accuracy of transcriptions and it also impacts the ability of markers/moderators to find evidence of student achievement against the performance standards.

School Assessment

Teachers can improve the moderation process and the online process by:

* thoroughly checking that all assessment tasks have been labelled correctly
* thoroughly checking have been uploaded correctly
* thoroughly checking that all grades entered in schools online are correct
* ensuring the uploaded tasks are legible, and that interactions and oral presentations are audible.
* ensuring task sheets and texts for text analysis tasks are included.

Assessment Type 1: Folio

The Folio should consist of between three and five tasks and should include at least an interaction, a text production, and a text analysis. In 2022, most schools chose to include the minimum number of three tasks only.

This year, schools used a variety of written and listening texts for text analysis, but some continued to rely heavily on past examination papers, which does not always provide students with enough variety or opportunities for in-depth analysis.

The students’ written work was varied and included a broad range of text types and topics. The accuracy levels were extremely variable as some teachers chose to use a drafting process whilst others did not.

Students were generally well prepared for oral interactions. Interactions must not be rehearsed and questions should not be given to students in advance. Some schools conducted interactions which were very similar to the end of year examination. Students and teachers are encouraged to conduct interactions on a variety of topics studied during the year, rather than an examination style oral.

Teachers are reminded to check to ensure oral interaction recordings are audible. Voice recording applications on phones or computer are recommended, as they are easy to use and provide high quality recordings.

Teachers may include marked samples for all tasks, including oral interactions.

The more successful responses commonly:

* made clear reference to the texts in text analysis
* used evidence/quotes from the text to support their answers
* used a wide range of complex language and structures in their production task(s)
* were well prepared for their interaction and were able to provide elaborated answers
* provided enough detail (i.e. when two answers or more were required).

The less successful responses commonly:

* gave short and/or incomplete or partial answers
* did not read the questions carefully
* failed to support their answers with evidence
* did not consider audience, context and text type when writing or analysing texts
* were unable to recognise or name stylistic/linguistic devices
* did not have good control of basic tenses and grammar.

Assessment Type 2: In-depth Study

Students complete an investigation demonstrating research and personal reflection on a cultural or social aspect or issue of a topic or subtopic associated with ‘The French-speaking Communities’ or ‘The Changing World’ themes. Students should complete three tasks: an oral presentation, a written or multimodal response in French and a reflective response in English.

For moderation purposes, it is helpful if teachers provide a summary of the student’s In-Depth study, as the topics are not always clear or obvious.

Teachers should check that their recordings are clear and audible, and provide grades for each element of the IDS (including the oral interaction)

The more successful responses commonly:

* used interesting topics related to the French Speaking World
* chose topics which allowed enough depth and reflection
* showed critical depth of thinking in their reflection
* had different context, audience, purpose and text type for the oral and written components
* provided information on different aspects of the chosen topic.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were based on personal experience (i.e. my stay in a French city…)
* chose topics that did not relate to the French speaking world
* chose topics which did not allow for enough depth/critical reflection
* included an oral presentation and written response which were too similar in audience, context or purpose
* were not able to critically reflect on their learning but simply reported on the process or gave a summary of their information
* lacked evidence of research.

External Assessment

Assessment Type 3: Examination

The examination consists of two assessments: an oral examination and a written examination.

Oral Examination

The oral examination of 10–15 minutes comprises a general conversation and a discussion of the student’s In Depth Study. In the conversation, students converse with the examiners about their personal world. This year the examinations were again conducted on-line.

Section 1: Conversation

The more successful responses commonly:

* were elaborate and extended, and on a wide range of topics
* flowed smoothly, demonstrating that students had practised extensively, using a wide range of questions framed flexibly
* were lively and interesting
* were relevant, structured, and detailed
* demonstrated depth of knowledge and the correct use of tenses, agreements, and vocabulary.

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked depth of ideas, grammatical correctness, and detail
* were dependent on questions being asked to encourage interaction
* demonstrated limited ability to maintain interaction
* were dependent on English word order patterns and some anglicised expressions, repeatedly asking for translation of English words into French (comment dit-on … en français?) without any effort to find another expression they might know.

Section 2: Discussion

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated a depth of research and exploration of the chosen topic that was of obvious interest to the students
* demonstrated a clear and substantial link to the themes of ‘The French-speaking Communities’ or ‘The Changing World’
* were able to answer a wide range of questions with clear, articulate, and well-referenced responses to aspects of their research highlighted on the in-depth study outline for oral examinations
* involved discussion that flowed smoothly, demonstrating that students had practised extensively and had depth and breadth of knowledge of their research
* involved discussions that were often lively and interesting where students were able to
* were relevant, structured, and detailed
* were aligned with the dot-points suggested as prompts for the discussion.

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked depth, grammatical correctness, and detail of the topic they had researched
* misunderstood specific vocabulary and questions relating to the topic they had researched
* demonstrated limited ability to maintain interaction
* demonstrated limited research and knowledge of the topic.

Written Examination

It is recommended that students access the online electronic practice examinations to familiarise themselves with this format, particularly regarding the limits on re-playing the listening passages and the use of the online keyboard for accent use. Some students managed this process very well, but some students used their own process of inserting accents or did not use them at all.

Section 1: Listening and Responding

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated an understanding of the two texts
* read and interpreted the questions to provide correct information, in both detail and number of points required
* provided detailed answers to stylistic and language feature questions
* used evidence from the texts paraphrased into English to support their answers
* provided thoughtful reflection where required.

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked depth, detail, and accuracy of information, including confusing the roles of speakers, or attributing details to the wrong speaker
* lacked depth, detail, and accuracy of stylistic and language features, often providing incorrect or untranslated evidence to support their answers
* contained limited evidence from the texts to support their answers.

Text 1

The more successful responses commonly:

* identified the two pieces of evidence required to support their answer about the people who would be interested by this advertisement.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were confused about who the advertisement had been written for
* identified only one or no pieces of evidence to support their interested person.

Text 2

The more successful responses commonly:

* identified that the text was a conversation between two people who were re-connecting after some years apart and explained how the two people knew each other
* explained how Marc’s feelings about the events that had impacted on his life
* and compared the two people’s lives since they had last met and identified the similarities between their lives since that meeting.

The less successful responses commonly:

* identified that the text was a conversation between a man and a woman without elaborating how the two had known each other in the past
* identified the events in Marc’s life but did not explain how he ‘felt’ about them
* identified one similarity between the two people’s lives.

Reading and Responding Part A

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated an understanding of the text
* provided detailed answers to the questions, including all required details, and supporting evidence, when the question asks for it
* used extensive evidence from the texts paraphrased into English to support their answers
* provided thoughtful reflection where required.

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked depth and detail, often providing incorrect or untranslated evidence to support their answers
* provided limited evidence from the texts to support their answers.

Text 3

The more successful responses commonly:

* explained who would be most likely to leave a comment on the blog
* identified and compared the two writers’ thoughts about their future and provided examples to support their answers
* explained fully how the two writers used linguistic and stylistic features to express themselves, providing several examples from the text to support their ideas.

The less successful responses commonly:

* misunderstood the content of the blog and were unable to explain how the two young people felt about their future
* provided answers which did not include evident from the text to support them
* were unclear how the young people used specific features to expression themselves and were unable to provide examples of these expressions.

Section 2: Reading and Responding

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated an understanding of how to write a personal email
* provided relevant and detailed responses to all of the ideas and questions presented in the text, adding relevant and interesting details to create interest in the reader
* demonstrated an excellent knowledge of grammatical concepts, tense, and connectors for this level.

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked depth, grammatical correctness, and detail
* did not meet the required minimum word count
* demonstrated limited ability to structure an email
* responded to only a limited number of ideas and questions raised in the text.

Section 3: Writing in French

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated a passion for and interest in the topic selected
* provided a well-written, structured, and interesting response, which engaged the reader
* demonstrated an excellent knowledge of grammatical concepts, tense, and connectors
* contained appropriately selected idiomatic expressions and grammatical concepts
* demonstrated evidence of planning
* adhered to the conventions of the text-type, and the stated context, audience and purpose
* contained a few errors, but they did not impede the meaning.

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked depth, grammatical correctness, and detail, which impeded meaning
* did not write in the required text-type
* used Anglicism or invented French expressions to communicate their ideas
* did not meet the required minimum word count
* were superficial in their treatment of the selected topic.