# Government of South Australia LogoSACE Board Logo2024 French (continuers) Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

This subject assessment advice, based on the 2024 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. It provides information and advice regarding the assessment types, the application of the performance standards in school and external assessments, and the quality of student performance.

The Subject Renewal program has introduced changes for many subjects in 2025; these changes are detailed in the change log at the front of each subject outline. When reviewing the 2024 subject assessment advice, it is important to consider any updates to this subject to ensure the feedback in this document remains accurate.

# School Assessment

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

* including marksheets and results for each component
* thoroughly checking that all assessment tasks have been labelled correctly
* thoroughly checking all files have been uploaded correctly
* thoroughly checking that all grades entered in Schools Online are correct
* ensuring the uploaded tasks are legible, and interactions and oral presentations are audible.

Assessment Type 1: Folio

The folio comprises three to five tasks, including at least *one* oral interaction, *one* text production, and *one* text analysis. As in previous years, in 2024 most students completed the minimum number of three tasks.

Schools used a variety of written and listening texts for text analysis, including past examination papers, but are encouraged to also use a variety of authentic texts.

The students’ written work included a broad range of text types and topics, and their accuracy and language mastery levels were variable.

Oral interactions were varied in topics. In order to ensure that students are provided with a variety of opportunities to show the breadth and depth of their linguistic capabilities over the year, questions asked should differ substantially from topics covered in the personal section of the externally assessed oral exam.

The task should be prepared but not scripted and should allow opportunities for spontaneous answers.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses in the oral interaction by:

* ensuring the task design allows students maximum opportunities to show their ability to interact. If the student gives a monologue presentation, there should be a sufficient question and answer session following the presentation to allow students to demonstrate sustained interaction, depth, and complexity
* individualising questions for each student and relating follow-up questions to information the student has provided, rather than following a predetermined list of questions.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses in the text analysis by:

* ensuring that questions about the text include questions about the language used, the text type, and the purpose of the text to assess all the specific features of Interpretation and Reflection
* if using past exams, checking carefully that the questions cover all the specific features required. In an exam, these are covered throughout the assessment type and may not all be covered in Section 1 or Section 2.

*The more successful responses commonly:*

* demonstrated in-depth knowledge and understanding of the topic, and included ideas that were well supported and justified
* included a strong variety of vocabulary and complex grammatical structures, including cohesive devices, with a high degree of accuracy in language structure and grammar
* included most requirements of the chosen text type
* included thorough reflection and analysis answers, citing relevant examples from texts, which allowed critical reflection and evaluation.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* lacked accuracy (including basic tenses and vocabulary) and demonstrated limited use of complex structures and cohesive devices
* lacked depth and detail
* relied on repetition and a basic vocabulary base
* only partially addressed audience, text type, and/or purpose.

Assessment Type 2: In-depth Study

Students conduct 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.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* guiding and helping their students to choose relevant and appropriate topics that allow for enough depth of treatment of ideas. Students should not choose themes that are too broad in nature
* encouraging their students to use a variety of French and English sources, as well as keeping a bibliography of websites and resources used.

The more successful responses commonly:

* selected interesting, engaging, and specific topics, allowing in-depth reflection and analysis
* approached broad themes with a novel and specific research question
* demonstrated evidence of thorough research
* demonstrated a high level of personal engagement and/or connection with the topic
* used a wide range of complex vocabulary and grammatical structures with a high degree of accuracy.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* chose topics that were too broad and/or too common
* provided series of facts about a topic and lacked personal reflection, depth, and analysis
* were repetitive: written response and oral presentation included similar elements
* recounted learning experiences rather than providing critical reflection
* lacked accuracy (including basic tenses and vocabulary) and demonstrated limited use of complex structures and cohesive devices
* included limited text type conventions.

# 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 online.

**Note:** The Subject Renewal program has introduced changes for the oral exam in 2025; these changes are detailed in the change log at the front of the subject outline.

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 replaying 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.

**Note:** The Subject Renewal program has introduced changes for the written exam in 2025; these changes are detailed in the change log at the front of the subject outline.

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 speaker’s negative attitude to the gym and provided comprehensive evidence to support their answer, identifying that the speaker was only going to the gym because his doctor had advised him (again) to do some exercise and that this time he should really make an effort, that he’s never been inside a gym before and hates doing exercise, and that he provided a range of excuses that made getting to the gym difficult
* identified what the speaker was looking for in a gym, providing comprehensive evidence to support their answer.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were confused about how the speaker felt about the gym and the reasons for this attitude
* identified only one or no pieces of evidence to support the speaker’s attitude and needs, which were only sometimes relevant.

Text 2

The more successful responses commonly:

* identified that the text was a conversation between two friends who were discussing their need for a holiday/break away from France: one because they were stressed out by noise, tourists, and prices and the other because his parents were welcoming friends from Australia and he had nowhere to stay
* explained what Arthur was looking for in a holiday destination: beach, water activities, French language (English not so good), French food, lots of seafood.

The less successful responses commonly:

* identified that the text was a conversation between a man and a woman but who wanted to go on holiday together and had similar reasons for going on a holiday
* identified some information about Arthur’s preferences in holiday destination
* identified information but attributed it to the wrong person.

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 asked 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:

* described the impact of the Olympic Games’ reach outside of Paris, providing appropriate (and correct) evidence from the text
* explained how the author conveyed the success of the Olympic Games, providing examples (e.g. statistics, quotes from spectator/organiser, records sales/spectators, enthusiasm) to support their answers
* explained fully why some French people were disappointed by the Games, providing several examples from the text to support their ideas.

The less successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated that the Olympic Games were being held in Paris, and that some events were being held elsewhere but confused which sports were being held where
* provided some understanding of the success of the Games but did not provide comprehensive evidence to support their answer
* demonstrated some misunderstanding of the reasons for the disappointment felt by some French people and confused some of the details.

Section 2: Reading and Responding

The more successful responses commonly:

* responded to both texts (sets of comments), including that they attended a concert by the **same** artist and that their experience was **different** to the ones described in the blog
* provided relevant and detailed responses to all the ideas presented in the whole text, adding relevant and sometimes humorous details to create interest in the reader
* provided a coherent and structured account of their concert experience
* 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 respond to comments and questions in the original text, some simply by not making any reference to some comments or only responding to comments from one text
* did not provide any information on their own concert experience.

Section 3: Writing in French

Students are reminded to read the topics carefully and ensure that they respond to all parts of the topic they select.

In Option 1 there were four supports for students to write about. Many students responded in detail to one or two of these supports but did not provide adequate attention to the others.

In Option 2 students were required to start or finish their response with ’C’était un accident!’

In Option 3 students were asked to write an article which persuaded the audience of the importance of participation in their chosen field **and** to provide their perspective through the use of examples from their own personal experience.

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.