

GCE

Edexcel GCE

French

Paper 6446 / 03

Summer 2006

Mark Scheme (Results)

Unit 6(c) Marking Guidelines

Q1. *Narrative*

Any plausible development is acceptable.

The best responses will show an attempt to explain, for example, why Gerbier is being held, the destination of the car, what fate awaits Gerbier, possible attempts to ingratiate himself with his captors, or to escape. There should be a clear outcome to the incident. A range of past tenses should be used.

Q2. *Dialogue*

The conversation should bring out the obvious contrast between the situations and attitudes of the two protagonists. No specialised detail about the North-South divide is required. Some sort of argument, which may be one-sided, should emerge, and an answer, however vague, to the question posed by the glutton.

Q3. *Les Alpes:*

Journalistic style.

Location? Weather?

Events?

Who? Whose fault?

Effects

Conclusions to be drawn, warnings.

Q4.

It is a government's responsibility to look after the welfare of its citizens. It should, therefore, educate people, inform them of the dangers of certain lifestyles and behaviour. Should make it easy for citizens to adopt a sensible life-style. This should have long term benefits for the individual and for the state in general. A happy, healthy population lives longer, has fewer problems, works more effectively. However, a government could be said to go too far in trying to dictate how people should behave, infringes on personal liberty. Should not dictate whether they should smoke or not, drive at a certain speed, eat healthily, drink sensibly, take exercise, have a certain number of children, what relationships they should enter into. Perhaps intervention will be seen as legitimate when one person's freedom of action harms other people, this will allow consideration of smoking in public, passive smoking.

Q5.

Perhaps more difficult to write in favour of war but candidates might say that war is in some cases the only solution as a last resort to stop certain countries/dictators acting unreasonably at the expense of another country. Countries should have the ultimate right to defend themselves by waging war. War might be seen as a decisive, quick solution. In some cases might be seen as the only way to prevent more suffering, more deaths. No doubt there will be much reference to Iraq but it should not just turn into a discussion of whether the war was justified. Probably easier to contend that war inevitably causes death, destruction, suffering, effects felt long after the cessation of hostilities. War should not be contemplated before all attempts at peaceful solutions have been exhausted.

Countries should sort out their differences by negotiation and dialogue. Some candidates might discuss terrorism as a form of modern warfare.

Q6.

It might be felt that such shows are harmless fun, people obviously like them, as they are popular. In some cases they have given individuals a chance to come to the fore which they would not otherwise have had, some have gone on to successful careers. They might be seen as interesting psychological studies, fascinating to watch various reactions to unusual situations. On the other hand, they could be seen as mindless, they appeal only to sensationalism, give opportunities to exhibitionists. The makers of such programmes exploit participants in order to shock and/or titillate. They appeal to the basest instincts. Extreme reactions might be dangerous for certain vulnerable individuals. Money could be spent on more serious, more worthwhile programmes.

Q7.

If certain minority arts did not receive state funding, they would cease to exist. Struggling artists in many fields need help to establish themselves. Works of art stimulate discussion, enhance the environment, lead people to question the world around them. A state without art would be colourless and drab. Some great artists of the past may well not have been able to produce their works if they had not been helped. State funding of museums, galleries, theatres etc means that art can be made available to all. A discussion of whether entry should be free might be relevant. On the other hand there could be felt to be much more deserving and important cases for state help. Education, the Health Service, the fight against poverty could all benefit from the money which is given to art which in many cases brings no practical, tangible advantage. Why should taxpayers who are not interested in art support the leisure interests of others? Art forms which are seen as the favourites exclusively of well-off people, such as opera, should not be subsidised. Ordinary people often find modern art puzzling and worthless, they certainly do not want to see their hard-earned taxes spent on them.

Q8.

The answer must be in the format of a report.

Highest marks to be awarded for answers which attempt to draw conclusions rather than simply repeating the information.

Possible advantages:

- Exciting opportunity, experience life in a foreign culture
- Nantes has much in its favour: good transport links and local public transport, leisure facilities, healthy life-style, interesting area, culture, other employment opportunities, excellent educational facilities for growing family
- Quality of life in France reputed to be better than in UK

Possible disadvantages:

- Uprooting self and family: big decision, family might be opposed
- Language problems
- Children must attend French schools
- Permanent employment?
- Cost of living?
- Employment laws?

- Relocation expenses?
- Risky for many reasons

Possible recommendations:

- Reassure employees about snags
- Stress positive side
- Give assurances about employment

Q9.

Informal letter format required.

Possible content and ideas:

The points listed in the rubric must be addressed. At best, they will be developed beyond simple direct questions.

- Candidates may adduce other ideas, eg:
- Too young to worry about this?
- Seek advice (parents, friends ..)
- Think of future studies and career, enjoy life

Beginning and ending appropriate to the situation.

TOTAL FOR PAPER: 40 MARKS