



FINNISH EDUCATION
EVALUATION CENTRE



FINNISH NATIONAL
BOARD OF EDUCATION

OUTCOMES OF LANGUAGE LEARNING AT THE END OF BASIC EDUCATION IN 2013



OUTCOMES OF LANGUAGE LEARNING AT THE END OF BASIC EDUCATION IN 2013

| | |
|--|----|
| BACKGROUND TO THE ASSESSMENT | 3 |
| OBJECTIVE OF THE ASSESSMENT | 4 |
| KEY OUTCOMES FOR SYLLABUS A IN ENGLISH | 6 |
| KEY OUTCOMES FOR SYLLABUS A IN SWEDISH | 8 |
| KEY OUTCOMES FOR SYLLABUS A IN FRENCH | 10 |
| KEY OUTCOMES FOR SYLLABUS B IN FRENCH | 12 |
| KEY OUTCOMES FOR SYLLABUS A IN RUSSIAN..... | 14 |
| KEY OUTCOMES FOR SYLLABUS B IN RUSSIAN..... | 16 |
| KEY OUTCOMES FOR SYLLABUS A IN GERMAN | 18 |
| KEY OUTCOMES FOR SYLLABUS B IN GERMAN | 20 |
| STUDENTS' OPINIONS OF THEIR LEARNING AND PROFICIENCY AND USEFULNESS OF THE ASSESSED LANGUAGES | 22 |
| OUTCOMES OF SWEDISH-SPEAKING SCHOOLS | 24 |
| RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ALL ASSESSED LANGUAGES..... | 25 |
| LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY SCALE..... | 26 |

Information materials 2015:1

Photography by Finnish National Board of Education/Hannu Piirainen | Design by Sirpa Ropponen/FINEEC | Printed by Juvenes Print - Suomen Yliopistopaino Oy

BACKGROUND TO THE ASSESSMENT

In early 2013, the Finnish National Board of Education carried out a sample-based evaluation of foreign languages and syllabus A for Swedish. Its purpose was to find out how students had fulfilled the learning objectives set out in the national core curriculum in 2004 by the time they were about to complete basic education. The assessment covered the most common languages learned in basic education: English, Swedish, French, German and Russian. Syllabus A (advanced) was assessed in English and Swedish, and both A and B (short) syllabuses were assessed in the other languages.

The number of schools and their students by language of instruction are found in the table below.

Table 1. Finnish- and Swedish-speaking sample schools and their student populations.

| Language and syllabus | Number of schools | | Number of students | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| | Finnish-speaking | Swedish-speaking | Finnish-speaking | Swedish-speaking |
| Syllabus A in English | 94 | 15 | 2 966 | 510 |
| Syllabus A in Swedish | 73 | - | 1 679 | |
| Syllabus A in French | 90 | - | 1 023 | - |
| Syllabus B in French | 76 | 23 | 909 | 301 |
| Syllabus A in Russian | 17 | - | 150 | - |
| Syllabus B in Russian | 85 | 4 | 823 | 31 |
| Syllabus A in German | 76 | - | 1 010 | - |
| Syllabus B in German | 89 | 19 | 1 078 | 271 |
| Total | 600 | 61 | 9 638 | 1 113 |

For each syllabus, all sample students completed the listening and reading comprehension exercises, and no more than 16 students performed the speaking exercises from each sample school.

The Finnish National Board of Education was responsible for the assessment of learning outcomes until May 2014 in accordance with the education evaluation plan set out by the Ministry of Education and Culture. In May 2014, the responsibility for the assessment of learning outcomes was transferred to the Finnish Education Evaluation Centre. At the national level, assessment data is used in the development of education, while at the local level education providers, principals, teachers and students can apply it in their daily work.

OBJECTIVE OF THE ASSESSMENT

The assessment sought to find answers to the following questions:

1. How were the learning objectives fulfilled for foreign languages and syllabus A in Swedish and how did the outcomes correspond to the national core curriculum?
2. Which student background factors and features of the learning environment explained the learning outcomes?

The national core curriculum sets out the target level required for good proficiency, or grade 8, for syllabus A in each of the languages. For syllabus B, the national core curriculum defines a higher and lower target level, which are not tied to a specific grade. These target levels are described on a proficiency scale, a Finnish adaptation of the six-point scale of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR 2003). The Finnish scale is an empirical match of the framework scale. For the Finnish proficiency scale, please see pages 26–27.

In addition to language proficiency, learning outcomes refer to the methods used to promote learning during lessons and outside school, and the students' opinions of the learning and usefulness of the assessed languages, and of their own proficiency (Figure 1).






Figure 1. Learning outcomes and explanatory factors.

KEY OUTCOMES FOR SYLLABUS A IN ENGLISH

Comprehension skills: Level of good proficiency B1.1

Students demonstrated good achievement of the **listening comprehension** objectives.

Students demonstrated good achievement of the **reading comprehension** objectives.

Language production skills: Level of good proficiency A2.2

Students demonstrated excellent achievement of the **speaking** objectives.

Students demonstrated excellent achievement of the **writing** objectives.

A total of 3,476 students from 109 schools participated in the assessment of learning outcomes for the syllabus A in the English language. The majority of the schools (86 per cent) were Finnish-speaking. Boys accounted for 51 per cent of students and girls for 49 per cent.

The best performance in meeting the level of good proficiency was found in speaking exercises (77 per cent), which were completed by nearly 50 per cent of the students. The level of good proficiency or higher was achieved by 72 per cent of the students in writing, 67 per cent in listening comprehension and 62 per cent in reading comprehension. The key explanatory factors for these results were plans for further study, using English outside the school, usefulness of English, parents' level of education, and language of instruction at the school. The best performance was demonstrated by students whose both parents had completed the matriculation examination and who had applied to general upper secondary school. Among those demonstrating a good level of proficiency, the number of students from the Swedish-speaking schools exceeded the sample average.

Students from Southern Finland were the highest achievers in all skill sets. The weakest performance in comprehension exercises was demonstrated by students from Northern Finland and in production exercises by students from Eastern Finland and Lapland. Of the types of municipalities, the best results were achieved in urban municipalities, followed by densely populated municipalities and then rural municipalities. The narrowest regional gap in learning outcomes was found in writing and the widest in listening comprehension.

During English lessons, word tests and oral paired exercises taken from exercise books were the most widespread methods used to promote learning. Teachers commonly spoke in English when addressing the whole class. Other than regularly completing their homework, the students were fairly unfamiliar with independent and self-directed study.

Use of English outside school was related to a range of language use scenarios requiring comprehension, such as listening to music, watching films or video clips, and following discussion forums.

Figure 2. Proficiency levels demonstrated by students in listening and reading exercises (Syllabus A in English).





Figure 3. Proficiency levels demonstrated by students in speaking and writing exercises (Syllabus A in English).



KEY OUTCOMES FOR SYLLABUS A IN SWEDISH

Comprehension skills: Level of good proficiency A2.2

Students demonstrated excellent achievement of the **listening comprehension** objectives.

Students demonstrated good achievement of the reading **comprehension** objectives.

Language production skills: Level of good proficiency A2.1

Students demonstrated excellent achievement of the **speaking** objectives.

Students demonstrated good achievement of the **writing** objectives.

A total of 1,679 students from 73 schools participated in the assessment of learning outcomes for syllabus A in the Swedish language. Boys accounted for 41 per cent of students and girls for 59 per cent.

The best performance in meeting the level of good proficiency was found in listening comprehension, in which 79 per cent of the students achieved the level of good proficiency or higher. The level of good proficiency or higher was achieved by 76 per cent of the students in speaking, 68 per cent in reading comprehension and 56 per cent in writing.

The key explanatory factors for these results were gender, plans for further study, parents' level of education and the syllabus of the Swedish language. The best performance was demonstrated by girls whose both parents were educated to the matriculation examination level, who had applied to general upper secondary school, and who studied the A1 syllabus in Swedish.

Students from Southwest Finland were the highest achievers in all skill sets. The ranking of the other geographical areas varied according to the skill sets. The best results were achieved in densely populated municipalities.

The majority of the students regularly completed their homework in the Swedish language. Teachers often spoke in Swedish during the lessons, and the students commonly performed paired spoken exercises from exercise books. In contrast, the objectives set out for the provision of a wide variety of study, application of ICT and, in particular, self-directed study were poorly achieved. The Swedish language was rarely used outside school, and the assessment methods focused on teacher-led written performance and word tests. Good language proficiency correlated most strongly to regular completion of homework and spoken exercises during lessons.

Figure 4. Proficiency levels demonstrated by students in listening and reading exercises (Syllabus A in Swedish).





Figure 5. Proficiency levels demonstrated by students in speaking and writing exercises (Syllabus A in Swedish).



KEY OUTCOMES FOR SYLLABUS A IN FRENCH

Comprehension skills: Level of good proficiency A2.2

Students demonstrated satisfactory achievement of the **listening comprehension** objectives.

Students demonstrated good achievement of the reading **comprehension** objectives.

Language production skills: Level of good proficiency A2.1

Students demonstrated good achievement of the **speaking** objectives.

Students demonstrated satisfactory achievement of the **writing** objectives.

A total of 1,023 students from 90 schools participated in the assessment of learning outcomes for syllabus A in the French language. The sample represented approximately 90 per cent of students who studied French in accordance with syllabus A in the ninth grade in 2012–2013. Girls accounted for 69 per cent of students and boys for 31 per cent. The majority had Finnish as their mother tongue (95 per cent).

The best performance in meeting the level of good proficiency was found in reading comprehension (66 per cent). The level of good proficiency was achieved by 56 per cent of the students in speaking exercises, which were completed by 77 per cent of the students, and 46 per cent in writing exercises. For the students, the most difficult skill to attain was listening comprehension, in which less than half of them demonstrated good proficiency. The key explanatory factors for the students' performance were regular completion of French homework, syllabus in the French language, finding French useful, parents' level of education and plans for further study. The best performance was demonstrated by girls whose both parents had completed the matriculation examination and who had applied to general upper secondary school.

Since most students who participated in the assessment of the syllabus A in the French language went to school in the urban municipalities in Southern Finland, the differences in student performance could not be explained by location.

Teachers commonly spoke in French when addressing the whole class and encouraged their students to use their French language skills outside school. However, students rarely engaged in extracurricular activities in French, with those who did mostly listening to music and watching films in French. The methods promoting learning during lessons or outside school and the students' language skills were not highly correlated, the only exception to this being the regular completion of French homework.

Figure 6. Proficiency levels demonstrated by students in listening and reading exercises (Syllabus A in French).





Figure 7. Proficiency levels demonstrated by students in speaking and writing exercises (Syllabus A in French).



KEY OUTCOMES FOR SYLLABUS B IN FRENCH

Comprehension skills: Higher target level A1.3

Students demonstrated good achievement of the **listening comprehension** objectives.

Students demonstrated good achievement of the **reading comprehension** objectives.

Language production skills: Higher target level A1.2

Students demonstrated good achievement of the **speaking** objectives.

Students demonstrated good achievement of the **writing** objectives.

A total of 1,210 students from 76 Finnish-speaking and 23 Swedish-speaking schools participated in the assessment of learning outcomes for syllabus B in the French language. Girls accounted for 75 per cent of students and boys for 25 per cent. The majority had Finnish as their mother tongue (74 per cent).

The best performance in meeting the higher target level was found in reading comprehension (82 per cent). The level of good proficiency was achieved by 66 per cent of the students in speaking exercises, which were completed by 78 per cent of the students, and 60 per cent in writing exercises. For the students, the most difficult skill to attain was listening comprehension, in which less than half of them demonstrated good proficiency. The key explanatory factors for the students' performance were regular completion of French homework, parents' level of education, plans for further study, language of instruction at the school, and finding the French language useful. The best performance was demonstrated by girls whose both parents had completed the matriculation examination and who had applied to general upper secondary school.

Based on the school's location, students from Eastern Finland demonstrated the weakest performance in all skill sets. By type of municipality, the best results were achieved in urban municipalities, followed by rural and densely populated municipalities.

Teachers commonly spoke in French when addressing the whole class. During lessons, students often listened to French songs, watched films and video clips, and carried out paired spoken exercises from exercise books. Methods related to self-assessment and planning of one's own work were infrequently applied. Outside school, students mainly practised French by sometimes listening to French music and watching films. The methods promoting learning during lessons or outside school and the students' language skills were weakly correlated, the only exception to this being the regular completion of homework, which in the assessment exercises correlated to the attainment of the higher target level in syllabus B in French.

Figure 8. Proficiency levels demonstrated by students in listening and reading exercises (Syllabus B in French).





Figure 9. Proficiency levels demonstrated by students in speaking and writing exercises (Syllabus B in French).



KEY OUTCOMES FOR SYLLABUS A IN RUSSIAN

Comprehension skills: Level of good proficiency A2.2

Students demonstrated good achievement of the **listening comprehension** objectives.

Students demonstrated excellent achievement of the **reading comprehension** objectives.

Language production skills: Level of good proficiency A2.1

Students demonstrated satisfactory achievement of the **speaking** objectives.

Students demonstrated good achievement of the **writing** objectives.

A total of 150 students from 17 Finnish-language schools participated in the assessment of learning outcomes for syllabus A in the Russian language. Girls accounted for 59 per cent of students and boys for 41 per cent. Finnish was the mother tongue for 93 per cent of the students and Russian for 7 per cent. For 85 per cent of the students, Finnish was also the main language spoken at home. Other languages were spoken by 7 per cent of the students, while 8 per cent had two or more home languages.

The best performance in meeting the level of good proficiency was found in reading comprehension (85 per cent). The level of good proficiency or higher was achieved by 72 per cent of the students in listening comprehension, 53 per cent of the students in writing and 46 per cent of the students in speaking. Proficiency levels did not reflect the normal distribution.

Girls and those students whose parents had been educated to the level of matriculation examination demonstrated the best performance. Analysed by language background, students whose mother tongue was Russian or who spoke Russian at home achieved the best results across all skill sets. The most efficient methods of improving language proficiency were the regular completion of homework and the use of Russian outside school. Authentic and oral use of Russian and independent language production during lessons also promoted success across the skill sets. A wide range of study methods correlated to better proficiency in comprehension skills, and students with the highest performance in production skills also demonstrated positive attitudes towards the Russian language.

Comparisons of the learning outcomes for syllabus A in Russian by school location or type of municipality were unfeasible since the majority of the students (74 per cent) came from the urban municipalities located in Southern Finland.

During the lessons for syllabus A in Russian, exercises were carried out regularly, as were word tests, and the teachers encouraged students to practise Russian outside school. However, the Finnish-language students rarely spoke Russian or followed the Russian-language media, and neither did they engage in the planning and assessment of their own work or use ICT. The Finnish-language students rarely engaged in Russian-language activities outside school.

Figure 10. Proficiency levels demonstrated by students in listening and reading exercises (Syllabus A in Russian).





Figure 11. Proficiency levels demonstrated by students in speaking and writing exercises (Syllabus A in Russian).



KEY OUTCOMES FOR SYLLABUS B IN RUSSIAN

Comprehension skills: Higher target level A1.3

Students demonstrated good achievement of the **listening comprehension** objectives.

Students demonstrated excellent achievement of the **reading comprehension** objectives.

Language production skills: Higher target level A1.2

Students demonstrated good achievement of the **speaking** objectives.

Students demonstrated good achievement of the **writing** objectives.

A total of 854 students from 85 Finnish-speaking schools and four Swedish-speaking schools participated in the assessment of learning outcomes for syllabus B in the Russian language. Boys accounted for 34 per cent of students and girls for 66 per cent. Finnish was the mother tongue for 92 per cent of the students and Swedish for 3 per cent. One or more other languages were spoken by 4 per cent of the students. Finnish was the main language spoken at home for 90 per cent of the students.

The higher target level or above was reached by 87 per cent of the students in listening and reading comprehension, 56 per cent in speaking exercises and 62 per cent in writing exercises.

The key explanatory factors for the students' performance were gender, parents' level of education, plans for further study, and mother tongue. The best performance in Russian was demonstrated by girls whose both parents were educated to the level of matriculation examination and who had applied to general upper secondary school, and those students whose mother tongue was a language other than Finnish or Swedish.

Regional comparison revealed that students from Southern and Eastern Finland scored the highest results in comprehension skills. By type of municipality, the best results were achieved in urban municipalities. Outcomes of the Swedish-speaking schools were slightly better than those of the Finnish-speaking schools.

The study methods with the greatest impact on language skills were the regular completion of homework, use of Russian outside the school, and the speaking or otherwise independent use of the language during lessons.

During the lessons for syllabus B in Russian, exercises were performed regularly, teachers spoke Russian, and the students often performed paired spoken exercises from exercise books. However, the use of authentic material and application of ICT rarely took place, and students seldom planned or assessed their own work. While they watched some video clips and listened to music during lessons, the Finnish-speaking students infrequently engaged in Russian-language activities outside school.

Figure 12. Proficiency levels demonstrated by students in listening and reading exercises (Syllabus B in Russian).





Figure 13. Proficiency levels demonstrated by students in speaking and writing exercises (Syllabus B in Russian).



KEY OUTCOMES FOR SYLLABUS A IN GERMAN

Comprehension skills: Level of good proficiency A2.2

Students demonstrated good achievement of the **listening comprehension** objectives.

Students demonstrated excellent achievement of the **reading comprehension** objectives.

Language production skills: Level of good proficiency A2.1

Students demonstrated good achievement of the **speaking** objectives.

Students demonstrated good achievement of the **writing** objectives.

A total of 1,010 students from 76 Finnish-language schools participated in the assessment of learning outcomes for syllabus A in the German language. Girls accounted for 57 per cent of students and boys for 43 per cent. Finnish was the mother tongue for 98 per cent of the students and the main language spoken at home for 95 per cent.

The best performance in meeting the level of good proficiency was found in reading comprehension (85 per cent). The level of good proficiency or higher was achieved by 82 per cent of the students in listening comprehension, 59 per cent of the students in speaking and 52 per cent of the students in writing.

The factors most clearly explaining performance across all language exercises were the parents' level of education, plans for further study, regular completion of exercises, use of the German language in one's free time, and the students' conceptions of themselves as learners.

The best performance was demonstrated by girls whose both parents were educated to the level of the matriculation examination, who had applied to general upper secondary school, and who studied the A1 syllabus in German. In regional terms, the best results, on average, were found in Southwest Finland and the weakest in Northern Finland and Lapland. By type of municipality, the best results were achieved in urban municipalities and the weakest in densely populated municipalities.

Of the study methods, the most successful methods for improving language proficiency were self-directed work, use of German during leisure time, and regular completion of exercises in the German language.

The better the students thought their language skills to be, the better they actually were. Furthermore, liking German and finding it useful correlated to a better performance in assignments measuring language skills.

Figure 14. Proficiency levels demonstrated by students in listening and reading exercises (Syllabus A in German).





Figure 15. Proficiency levels demonstrated by students in speaking and writing exercises (Syllabus A in German).



KEY OUTCOMES FOR SYLLABUS B IN GERMAN

Comprehension skills: Higher target level A1.3

Students demonstrated excellent achievement of the **listening comprehension** objectives.

Students demonstrated excellent achievement of the **reading comprehension** objectives.

Language production skills: Higher target level A1.2

Students demonstrated excellent achievement of the **speaking** objectives.

Students demonstrated good achievement of the **writing** objectives.

A total of 1,349 students from 108 schools participated in the assessment of learning outcomes for syllabus B in the German language. Of these schools, 89 were Finnish-speaking and 19 Swedish-speaking. 80 per cent of the students went to a Finnish-speaking school and 20 per cent to a Swedish-speaking school. Girls accounted for 62 per cent of students and boys for 38 per cent.

The best performance in meeting the higher target level was found in listening comprehension (97 per cent), followed by reading comprehension (94 per cent), speaking (92 per cent) and writing (76 per cent).

For all skill sets, the background factors explaining the students' performance the most were their gender, mother tongue, their parents' level of education and their plans for further study. In addition, factors explaining some skill sets included independent practice of spoken language and the use of media in studying, as well as the student's opinions of their own language proficiency and the usefulness of the German language. The best performance in German was demonstrated by girls whose both parents were educated to the level of matriculation examination and whose mother tongue was Swedish.

In regional comparisons, the best performance, on average, was found in Southwest and Southern Finland and the poorest performance in Eastern Finland. By municipality type, students in densely populated municipalities performed best in listening comprehension and students in urban municipalities in reading comprehension. Outcomes of the Swedish-speaking schools were higher than those of the Finnish-speaking schools.

Figure 16. Proficiency levels demonstrated by students in listening and reading exercises (Syllabus B in German).





Figure 17. Proficiency levels demonstrated by students in speaking and writing exercises (Syllabus B in German).




STUDENTS' OPINIONS OF THEIR LEARNING AND PROFICIENCY AND USEFULNESS OF THE ASSESSED LANGUAGES

Students' opinions of the assessed languages were gauged with the help of statements on the language study, usefulness of the language, and the students' perceptions of their own proficiency on a response scale, where the extremes were completely disagree – completely agree. Value 3 in the scale represented a neutral opinion.


Across the A syllabuses, the most positive opinions expressed by the students were related to the usefulness of the language. While English, Russian and Swedish were considered to be particularly useful at work, in further studies and in daily communication, students expressed, on average, a neutral opinion on liking the subject across all of the assessed languages. The highest confidence in their own abilities was expressed by students in English, followed by a slightly lower confidence in Swedish and the lowest confidence in French.

Figure 18. Opinions of studying syllabus A, usefulness, and own proficiency.



For B syllabuses, students expressed, on average, neutral opinions of liking the subject, usefulness, and their own proficiency. The only exception to this was syllabus B in Russian, where on average the students had positive opinions of the usefulness of Russian.

Figure 19. Opinions of studying syllabus B, usefulness and own proficiency.



OUTCOMES OF SWEDISH-SPEAKING SCHOOLS

For the Swedish-speaking schools, learning outcomes were assessed for syllabus A in English, B in French, B in German and B in Russian. Across all languages, the students from Swedish-speaking schools achieved better results than their peers from the Finnish-speaking schools. Their performance was especially highlighted in the achievement of the highest proficiency levels across all language skill sets.

On average, compared to the students in Finnish-language schools, the students expressed more positive opinions on the learning of the assessed languages, demonstrating notably stark differences in syllabus B in French when analysed by language of instruction.



RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ALL ASSESSED LANGUAGES

- Students should be given more opportunities to plan and assess their own work, for example by using the European Language Portfolio.
- The range of ICT applications in language teaching should be increased from the current level.
- Authentic learning materials and contacts with schools abroad should be increased.
- More varied use of assessment methods should be considered. In grading, assessment should be made transparent by determining the relationship between language skills and the effort the student has made.
- The objectives and assessment of syllabus B in languages should be clarified.
- In assessment, equal importance should be given to oral language skills and written skills.
- Homework and homework practices should be modernised.
- Students should be encouraged to select other foreign languages alongside English and study them with clear targets in mind.

LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY SCALE

Language proficiency achieved by students across the skill sets (listening comprehension, reading comprehension, speaking, writing) was described by using the language proficiency scale set out in the national core curriculum.

http://www.oph.fi/english/curricula_and_qualifications/basic_education

| Proficiency level A1 | | Limited communication in the most familiar situations | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | Listening comprehension | Speaking | Reading comprehension | Writing |
| A1.1 | First stage of elementary proficiency | Can understand a very limited number of the most common words and phrases in everyday contexts. | Can answer simple questions about personal details in short sentences. | Is familiar with the alphabet, but understands little of the text. | Can communicate immediate needs using very brief expressions. |
| A1.2 | Developing elementary proficiency | Can understand a limited number of words, short sentences, questions and requests of a personal or immediate nature. | Can communicate some immediate needs in a limited manner and ask and answer in dialogues about basic personal details. | Can understand names, signs and other very short and simple texts related to immediate needs. | Can communicate immediate needs in brief sentences. |
| A1.3 | Functional elementary proficiency | Can understand simple utterances in routine discussions with support from context. | Can briefly describe him/herself and his/her immediate circle. Can manage in the most straightforward dialogues and service situations. | Can read familiar and some unfamiliar words. Can understand very short messages dealing with everyday life and routine events or giving simple instructions. | Can manage to write in the most familiar, easily predictable situations related to everyday needs and experiences. |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|
| Proficiency level A2 | | Basic needs for immediate social interaction and brief narration | | | |
| A2.1 | First stage of basic proficiency | Can understand simple speech or follow discussions about topics of immediate personal relevance. | Can describe his/her immediate circle in a few short sentences. Can handle simple social exchanges and the most common service situations. | Can understand simple texts containing the most common vocabulary. | Can manage in the most routine everyday situations in writing. |
| A2.2 | Developing basic proficiency | Can understand enough to be able to meet the needs of a concrete type. | Can give a small, enumerated description of his/her immediate circle and its everyday aspects. Can take part in routine discussions about personal details or interests. | Can understand the main points and some details of messages consisting of a few paragraphs in fairly demanding everyday contexts. | Can manage in routine everyday situations in writing. |
| Proficiency level B1 | | Dealing with everyday life | | | |
| B1.1 | Functional basic proficiency | Can understand the main points and key details of speech dealing with themes regularly encountered in school, work or leisure. | Can handle the most common everyday situations and informal exchanges in the language area. Can communicate topics of personal relevance even in slightly more demanding situations. | Can read a few pages of a wide variety of texts. | Can write an intelligible text about familiar, factual or imaginary topics of personal interest, also conveying some detailed everyday information. |
| B1.2 | Fluent basic proficiency | Can understand clear factual information related to familiar and fairly general topics in fairly demanding contexts. | Can speak about common concrete topics, using descriptions, specifications and comparisons, and can also explain other topics. | Can read a few paragraphs of text about many different topics. | Can write personal and even more public messages, describing news and expressing his/her thoughts about familiar abstract and cultural topics. |
| Proficiency level B2 | | Managing regular interaction with native speakers | | | |
| Proficiency levels C1–C2 | | Managing in a variety of demanding use situations | | | |

This summary is based on the publications found online at www.karvi.fi and www.oph.fi/maksuttomat_julkaisut

PUBLICATIONS

Englannin kielen A-oppimäärän oppimistulokset perusopetuksen päättövaiheessa 2013 (Learning outcomes for syllabus A in English at the end of basic education in 2013)

Ruotsin kielen A-oppimäärän oppimistulokset perusopetuksen päättövaiheessa 2013 (Learning outcomes for syllabus A in Swedish at the end of basic education in 2013)

Ranskan kielen A- ja B-oppimäärän oppimistulokset perusopetuksen päättövaiheessa 2013 (Learning outcomes for syllabuses A and B in French at the end of basic education in 2013)

Venäjän kielen A- ja B-oppimäärän oppimistulokset perusopetuksen päättövaiheessa 2013 (Learning outcomes for syllabuses A and B in Russian at the end of basic education in 2013)

Saksan kielen A- ja B-oppimäärän oppimistulokset perusopetuksen päättövaiheessa 2013 (Learning outcomes for syllabuses A and B in German at the end of basic education in 2013)

Inlärningsresultaten i främmande språk i de svenskspråkiga skolorna 2013 (Learning outcomes for foreign languages in Swedish-speaking schools in 2013)

AUTHORS

Raili Hildén, Marita Härmälä, Juhani Rautopuro, Mari Huhtanen, Mika Puukko and Chris Silverström

Finnish Education Evaluation Centre (FINEEC)

P.O. Box 28 (Mannerheiminaukio 1 A)

FIN-00101 HELSINKI, FINLAND

E-mail: kirjaamo@karvi.fi

Switchboard: +358 (0)29 533 5500