

Examiners' Report/  
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2013

GCE French (6FR03)  
Paper 1A

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2013

Publications Code US035956

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

## **Unit 3: Understanding and Spoken Response in French**

### **General Introduction**

This report will review the operation of this year's examination session. It will analyse candidate performance and suggest ways in which they and their teachers can help to improve outcomes. It will comment on teacher conduct of the examination, which is a matter of concern for some.

It will also serve to introduce new centres to the examination.

### **Purpose of the Test**

This unit seeks to assess the candidate's ability to discuss a limited number of issues in some depth. The first of these is chosen by the candidate and is examined in the form of a debate and the remainder by the examiner who promotes discussion of the issues.

Centres are once again reminded that the prime objective of the test is to demonstrate the candidate's ability to use language spontaneously in response to promptings from the examiner and not rehearse prepared material.

Candidates are expected to show detailed knowledge of the chosen issue and debating skills by:

- defending their views on a chosen issue whilst under robust challenge from the examiner

They are then required to show a good level of awareness of topical issues by:

- sustaining discussion on a further 2 or 3 issues selected by the examiner

The trend observed over previous years to produce contrived tests is ever more pronounced. It runs counter to the requirements of the specifications and can result in damaging outcomes for both centres and candidates.

At worst, such practices may be interpreted as collusion between examiner and candidate and be referred to the Compliance section of Pearson Education for investigation. At best, the absence of any truly spontaneous language will seriously restrict the mark range, resulting in a low grade.

## **Format of the Test**

The test should last between 11 – 13 minutes.

Centres are reminded that timing starts from the moment the candidate begins to make the opening statement and not when the examiner begins the preliminary discussion.

*Including these details in the overall time can lead to a test being assessed as short. This will incur a penalty that may affect the overall grade.*

The candidate makes a short statement outlining the reasons for the stance adopted. The statement should last no longer than 1 minute.

A robust challenge of this position should then be mounted by the examiner and debate should continue for a further 4 minutes.

*Too many centres fail to mount a robust challenge to a candidate's stance, choosing instead to ask for explanation rather than requiring the candidate to justify the position adopted. Such an approach means that candidates cannot be credited for any debating skills they may have, thereby limiting the mark for this section.*

After roughly 5 minutes, the examiner will signal that the first part of the test is over by telling the candidate that they are moving on to the second part.

*It is important that centres observe this procedure as it is not always clear to markers that the second issue is not, in fact, a prolongation of the first; in which case candidates may be penalised by not being credited with the requisite number of further issues.*

The examiner will then proceed to a discussion of 2 or 3 further issues with the candidate. The objective is no longer to attack the candidate's position but to determine the extent of their awareness of current issues.

Far too many centres treat this section as an opportunity for candidates to produce a series of pre-learnt statements in response to a list of issues offered by the examiner, with no examination of these.

*This is not what is required and results in candidates being penalised for failing to show judgment and understanding.*

## Defining terms

It may be helpful to remind centres of the interpretation of certain terms used in the specifications.

## The Issue

An issue is generally a morally or ethically contentious problem – such as abortion or the death penalty. Very careful attention should be paid to the choice of issue. It needs to be capable of sustained argument from both sides. The best ones are those that will suggest a possible developmental pathway for the second issue.

For various reasons, it is advisable, where possible to start the Discussion part of the test by picking up on something touched upon in the Debate section. For example, a debate on abortion will raise issues of the sanctity of life, the right of others to decide on an individual's right to life, women's rights, adoption etc. Any one of these could offer an opening to the second part of the test. This can be of not inconsiderable comfort to the candidate.

## Strong/Good issues would be:

Je suis pour la légalisation du cannabis / Je suis contre l'IVG / je suis pour la limitation de l'immigration / je suis contre l'euthanasie / je suis pour le mariage homosexuel / je suis contre l'adoption homosexuelle / je suis contre les cartes d'identité / je suis contre la suppression des symboles religieux / je suis pour la peine de mort / je suis contre les concours de beauté / je suis pour la chirurgie esthétique / je suis pour le vote à 16 ans / je suis contre la prison pour les juvéniles / je suis contre la gratuité des frais universitaires / je suis pour le mariage des prêtres catholiques / je suis contre l'expérimentation animale / je suis pour le "don présumé" des organes / je suis contre l'énergie nucléaire / je suis pour la recherche sur les cellules souches / je suis contre les OGM's / je suis pour la prostitution / je pense que l'intégration des immigrés est préférable à leur assimilation / je suis contre la discrimination positive / je pense que les femmes sont responsables du sexisme / je suis pour le droit de vote pour les détenus /

*Issues such as these are preferable because they:*

- *are contentious*
- *allow both sides to mount good arguments*
- *have enough substance to permit sustained, detailed discussion*
- *suggest possibilities for the first "subsequent" issue.*

### **Examples of weaker issues:**

In general, weaker issues are the result of poor thinking when being formulated by the candidate.

Some examples: -

je suis contre l'influence des magazines adressés aux jeunes filles / je suis pour internet / je suis contre la taille zéro / je suis contre la laïcité en France / je suis contre les JO à Londres / je suis pour les mesures plus draconiennes pour protéger la planète / je suis pour le génie génétique / je suis contre les éoliennes / je suis pour la voiture électrique / je suis contre le don des organes obligatoire.

Thus, "je suis contre la taille zéro" puts the examiner in an impossible position for, whilst it may possible to argue in favour of extreme thinness , it would be difficult to sustain any worthwhile debate. *It is certainly a controversial issue but it is basically unarguable.* Also, when a candidate claims they are against laïcité in France, what is usually meant is that they are against restrictions on dress codes rather than the separation of State and Religion. *The issue has been poorly expressed and could result in a candidate being marked down for failing to address the issue as stated.*

### **Examples of poor choices:**

Les troubles alimentaires ne sont pas causés par les médias / je suis contre le tabac / je suis contre les mannequins trop maigres / je suis contre l'organisation des compétitions de "surf" / je suis contre la pédophilie / je suis contre la participation à la guerre civile, il y a d'autres moyens de défendre la démocratie / je suis contre l'exploitation des ressources naturelles / je suis contre les jeux olympiques / Dieu existe. These are unarguable

***The choice and formulation of the Issue is of the utmost importance. It ensures that the candidate focuses properly on the important arguments and it prepares for the second part of the test, making it more likely that meaningful debate will occur in the first section and that the second issue will not come as a total surprise, allowing for a calmer and more productive transition.***

## **Effective interaction**

Candidates are deemed to be interacting effectively when they address directly comments/remarks/questions/prompts made by the examiner. The same is also required of the examiner.

For a proper exchange of views to be had, both parties must acknowledge what the other says, otherwise communication will be inefficient as common ground will not be established and ambiguities will occur. In what they say, both parties must refer to elements of the other's contribution – to accept it, to reject it, to question it etc. – before proceeding to produce an appropriate reply.

*It follows that where this convention is not observed; there can be no effective interaction. Thus, centres that conduct tests in such a way that their candidates' responses have little, if any, relationship to the points raised by the examiner are betraying their best interests as markers will see this as an example of lack of spontaneity and mark accordingly.*

## **Spontaneous discourse**

At the risk of repeating what has already been written, it is important to make the following points: -

*Discourse describes the exchange of opinion and information on an issue between two or more people. In practice, this means that each participant addresses the points made by the other in previous remarks. Simply put, this means candidates should respond appropriately to the teacher examiner's input whether that be a question, a comment, a remark or a request.*

Candidates should not assume that by saying something vaguely related to the topic they will be deemed to have fulfilled the criteria for discourse. They should be trained to listen closely to what the other person says and respond appropriately, engaging fully with what has been said.

Spontaneity is often perceived as a troublesome notion but it need not be. Clearly, candidates who have been properly prepared for the speaking test will have a store of ideas and phrases they can call upon as required. This is not only perfectly reasonable but also desirable. Spontaneity does not equate to novelty. Candidates do not have to produce wholly new utterances in response to questions they have never encountered before. Spontaneous use of language arises from manipulating the reservoir of structures and lexis they have acquired in preparing for the examination in response to the unpredictable nature of the discussion as it unfolds.

***The unpredictability is created by the teacher examiner picking up on a remark and probing for greater clarity or further explanation or opinion, thus forcing the candidate to re-formulate ideas and by so doing produce language spontaneously. The role of the teacher examiner in ensuring that a proper level of spontaneity is maintained cannot be overstated.***

Tests where neither candidates nor teacher examiners explore the detail of what one or the other has said, cannot be accepted as examples of proper discussion and do not qualify as spontaneous discourse. As will be seen when this report comes to discuss the mark scheme, this could have a negative impact/consequence for the Response mark.

## **Sustaining discussion**

It is important for centres to understand that this does not mean “keeping going till the end of the 13 minutes”. It refers to the exploration of the various issues. Each of these will have several facets and should not be despatched in a one-line answer. Investigating these facets and the candidate’s response to them ensures that a proper discussion is going on. The longer the exchanges persist on an issue, the more discussion is sustained. Properly conducted tests will reap the benefit across the mark scheme and not just in Response, as sustained discourse has repercussions for every assessment category – showing greater knowledge and understanding in Reading and Research and Comprehension and Development. In fact, this is what is meant by Development – the ability to offer further avenues for investigation on a given issue.

## **The mark scheme**

The mark scheme embodies the features of the specifications highlighted above. It rewards candidates who:

- have something of substance to say about topical issues, under close examination
- can communicate their thoughts spontaneously and clearly, with no loss of meaning
- display a wide range of appropriate vocabulary and structures.

The total mark obtainable is 50.

## **Markers assess 4 skills:**

**Response** (a possible 20 marks) assesses:

- how far a response is spontaneous or rehearsed
- whether the discussion is being conducted at the appropriate level of abstraction and how ably the candidate handles this type of language
- the candidate’s language resources

If candidates engage reasonably in useful discussion of abstract issues, they will score in the 9 – 12 box at least. If, however, it is clear that the test is not a genuine discussion but merely a sequence of pre-arranged questions and answers, they will not progress beyond 8.

**Quality of language** (a possible 7 marks) assesses:

- the degree to which misuse of language impairs the message

If there is no loss of message candidates will score at least 4. If the incidence of basic error is intrusive, the mark will be adjusted downwards.

**Reading and Research** (a possible 7 marks) assesses:

- the candidate’s level of awareness and understanding of both the general issues and the chosen issue for debate.

Whilst **detail** is an important element when assessing how well the candidate has prepared for the **initial issue**, it is unreasonable to expect candidates to produce as much detail when discussing subsequent unpredictable issues. In this case, what is sought is evidence that the candidate has read widely, and in some depth, on issues that an informed young person sitting Advanced levels might be expected to have thought about.



**Comprehension and development** (a possible 16 marks) assesses:

- the ability to decipher the sounds of the language correctly
- decode the meaning accurately – including inferred meaning
- exploit the issue under discussion by developing it further independently.

Centres should ensure that the level of difficulty of questions is appropriate for this level of examination. Some revisit themes already dealt with in the AS oral. Questions should be devised in terms of the response the candidate will have to make and how difficult that is.

Candidates can do well in this area. If they display no problems understanding they will obviously be awarded a high mark for that element, which may or may not be maintained depending on how well they are able to develop the discussion, by offering further pathways for investigation.

### **Candidate performance**

It is again very pleasing to report that many candidates were able to discuss issues easily. Examiners, visiting in particular, expressed huge admiration for the ability of many candidates to discuss as freely in French as in their own language. Centres are to be congratulated on their achievement in helping candidates reach such a level of competence. *Where tests were conducted correctly, candidates could engage in productive discussion of their chosen and other issues. However, the outcome for many still reflects the fact that tests are conducted in a manner that does not meet the requirements of the specifications either in respect of spontaneous discourse or demonstrating awareness of an issue through sustained discussion – or both.*

### **Response**

Whilst a good number of candidates are able to conduct a spontaneous discussion on a limited range of issues, many were not prepared, or had not been prepared, to go further without more prompting.

*Candidates should be aware that those who do best are the ones who seek to lead the discussion rather than follow it.*

Candidates should be trained to structure their contributions along the following lines:

- declaring an understanding of the examiner's remarks
- acknowledging what truth they see in it – if any
- indicating where they might be at odds with it
- stating why
- substantiating their own view with examples or reference to some recognised authority
- conceding that not everyone may share their opinion
- offering further pathways on the same issue for the examiner to explore.

## Range of lexis and structures

Nearly all candidates understand that:

- there are notions of gender and number but frequently display erratic mastery of these notions - les femmes ils doivent pouvoir disposer de sa corpse
- nouns need to be supported by articles etc. but many extend this to proper nouns as in - le Paris - whilst simultaneously refraining from doing so with names of countries – i.e. France a besoin de ... and plural nouns are very often unsupported – i.e. “prisons sont des places de vacances ...”
- the usual place of the adjective is after the noun and the adverb after the verb but too many still resort to English syntactical order as in: -le seulement problème ... la financière crise ... un change très grande ... nous rarement mangeons en famille ... nous toujours avons des cartes d’identité ... ces télévision cameras ... and agreement is an occasional or esoteric feature for many
- clauses should contain a verb - and statements such as “et c’est pourquoi je contre le clônage” are thankfully rare
- verbs should be conjugated
- **but applying this to verbs in subordinate clauses is an area where failure is more common than success**
- there is something called Tense but are only really confident in the Present and the Conditional
- things can be compared and are at ease with the construction

Areas that are generally problematic:

- object pronouns – especially when far from the verb
- personal adjectives
- demonstrative adjectives

## Subordination

Attention was drawn to this feature last year:

*“Overall, it was observed that Subordination, which is a key feature of French, is not done well by a significant number of candidates. The notion that phrases / clauses have to be linked in French and cannot be merely collocated as in English, continues to trouble many candidates. Qui and Que are interchangeable for too many still. Whilst, in general, candidates remember to include que when it is part of their initial response, as in a stock phrase such as “je pense que...” beyond that point the relative tends to disappear as in ... et je sais les parents veulent contrôler quoi leurs enfants faire”.*

There has been no change to this situation which is disappointing as it is a crucial distinguishing syntactical feature and by this stage should have been understood better by candidates. Use of ce qui and ce que; dont, lequel etc is reserved to the more able candidates, although encouragingly en ce qui (me) concerne is quite widely used.

## Mood

The use of the subjunctive is quite widespread and not just in stock phrases as recorded last year. This is a continuing development and centres are to be congratulated on the improvement in this area. The passive voice is not required in the productive mode, which is just as well perhaps as invariably candidates get it wrong.

## Hypothetical Language

- “si” clauses continue to cause confusion, mostly in the main clause verb
- The Conditional of devoir is frequently used as if it contained the verb “être” or “avoir” as in “ il devrait une loi pour protéger les gens contre l’espionnage” or “il

serait une récompense pour les qui .....

### **Pronunciation and Intonation**

- most candidates have a tolerably good accent but loss of message still occurs as a result of poor pronunciation. It can be the feature that decides whether a 3 or a 4 for Accuracy is awarded.

### **Common pronunciation errors**

All the features highlighted in previous reports are present in this year's cohort:

- final consonants – ilz, lez, nouz, danz le casse où, passer le tempes, disposer de son corpse, il est treize petite, bioucoupe etc
- nasal vowels – innetésstant, symepathétique, mennesonge, il est mort de femme(!), la faim est l'égal de l'homme - le pain de mort - les musulmans
- semi-vowels – les gense qui résident dans cet paille
- poor middle vowels -- les jeunes , les gens et les jaunes
- opposition [y] / [u]
- amour – mort – this occurs frequently and gives rise to statements along the lines "un enfant a besoin de beaucoup de morts dans sa vie".

### **Other frequently noted errors**

#### **Confusion over il y a or il est (avoir / être)**

je pense qu'il n'est pas assez de jeunes ... je pense que vous ne devez pas avoir le droite de vote quand vous êtes 16 ans ... il ne sera pas un parti avec la majorité ... il n'a jamais été des preuves ... je pense qu'ils sont très peur ... ils ont (sont) destabillise(s) il a des gens comme moi ... i l est des lois qui ....

#### **Confusion over Connaitre and Savoir**

je connais qu'il est difficile ... Je sais quelqu'un qui ....

#### **Anglicised syntax**

c'est important pour les parents enseigner leurs enfants quoi est important la chose que je parlais de ...

#### **Expressions of quantity**

beaucoup des gens, plusieurs de personnes, milliers étudiants, plus et plus personnes.

#### **Quality of Language**

Most candidates are capable of producing language that conveys adequately what they have to say.

#### **Reading and Research**

Candidates continue to be well prepared for the initial debate and there was ample evidence of serious research having been done. Good to very good marks were frequently recorded for this aspect of the grid. However, assessment of wider reading was not so positive. Centres are reminded that the second part of the examination is not meant to be a review of all the issues dealt with throughout the year but rather their understanding of one or two of them. This means proper in-depth discussion of the subsequent issues, rather than one-line question and answer exchanges, is what is required - as has been stated above at several other points.

#### **Comprehension and Development**

The oral test is used to assess candidates' understanding of the spoken language. If

candidates show that they can make sense of the sounds they hear by responding in a way that demonstrates understanding of meaning, they will score highly. If, in so doing, they can promote further discussion of the issue by offering avenues for development, they will reinforce their Comprehension mark.

*No candidate was unable to understand what was being said. A few candidates misinterpreted a comment but these were rare and in the main candidates displayed a very good understanding of Spoken French in a conversational context. However, too many were unable to develop discussion of the issues, either because of lack of preparation and or they had no ideas or were not offered an opportunity to do so.*

### **Teacher Examiner Performance**

This is a crucial element of the examination. A poorly conducted test can disadvantage a candidate. Teacher examiners can benefit from training on how to conduct the oral examination. Centres are reminded of the description of the unit to be found in Section A of the Specifications, on page 6:

*"Candidates first outline their chosen issue for about one minute, adopting a definite stance towards the issue. They should then defend and justify their opinions for up to four minutes. The teacher examiner will then initiate a spontaneous discussion in which a minimum of two further unpredictable areas will be covered."*

There are several important implications for examiners here which are outlined below.

### **Timing**

Candidates should not be allowed to go beyond 1 minute when presenting their stance. To do so would take time from the ensuing debate and limit candidates' ability to demonstrate depth of research and ability to marshal arguments.

This will inevitably be reflected in the Reading and Research mark.

Nor should they be allowed to extend the initial issue beyond 5 minutes. The more time spent on a familiar well-rehearsed topic, the less remains for candidates to demonstrate their ability to deal satisfactorily with unpredictable issues.

Again this will be reflected in the Reading and Research mark but also in the Response mark.

Candidates who are allowed to discuss their chosen issue for the whole test, will not be demonstrating wide reading nor can they be considered to be reacting to unpredictable situations. In such cases, candidates' marks for Response will be restricted to the 5 – 8 box and will not rise above 3 – 4 for Reading and Research.

Adhering to the full span of time allotted to the exam is also very important as short tests mean that candidates' marks for Response and Comprehension and Development will be moved down to the box below the one they would have been put in if the exam had been of the right length.

It should be observed that the test is timed from the moment candidates begin their presentation and not from when they are greeted and announced on the tape/CD track.

### **Debate/Discussion**

The first section of the test is designed to assess whether candidates are able to marshal their thoughts under a sustained attack on their positions from the examiner. Therefore, tests that fail to do this and require only that candidates explain, clarify and exemplify their

positions will not score well in this section.

The second section of the test is designed to assess candidates' ability to discuss a further 2 or 3 issues that they may have covered in class or private study. The emphasis here is on discussion. This section is often poorly conducted. Too many teacher/examiners do not discuss issues with candidates. Often they ask for opinions but do not seek to elicit the reasons why these opinions are held, moving quickly on to the next issue where the same procedure is observed. The result is a selection of superficial "question and answer" exchanges with no exploration of candidates' knowledge and understanding. There are many tests that resemble "good GCSE" exams in which identical topics are addressed – i.e. manger sain / garder la forme / la pratique d'un sport / les loisirs etc. As stated above, this is not an appropriate level for the A" examination and will be penalised at the marking stage, unless treated in a more abstract way. The effects of such an approach will be seen in lower marks for Reading and Research and Comprehension and Development as candidates will not have been afforded an opportunity to display detail on the one hand nor the ability to expand the issue under discussion on the other.

### **Spontaneity / Unpredictability**

These points have been touched upon already, at several points in this report. When a teacher examiner conducts a test correctly, issues are treated unpredictably. This does not mean that candidates will be expected to talk about things they have never heard of. Candidates should be told that they will be expected to discuss any of the issues they have worked on in class or at home. Which ones arise and how they are treated constitutes the unpredictable nature of the test and thereby ensures that candidates' responses are spontaneous. Centres that use the same issues for each candidate and the same set of questions – should take note of this. Such an approach will adversely affect their candidates' marks.

### **Centre performance**

#### **Visiting Examiners**

It is expected that centres will play an active role in organising and agreeing visiting dates and submitting paperwork on time in order not to disadvantage candidates. They should also ensure that Visiting Examiners are provided with the best possible conditions to perform their duties. They are reminded that Visiting Examiners are advised not to examine in unacceptable conditions.

#### **Recording**

The most commonly mentioned problems with this are:

- noisy equipment / machine hum / clunky microphones
- one or more of the participants "faint" – generally the candidate
- outside noise
- colleagues intruding on the test – in person or via electronic means
- recording at the wrong speed
- failure to record candidates
- failure to announce candidates – i.e. name / number / Issue
- candidate order not specified on CD's
- CD's not formatted for play on multiple players.

***In addition, this year several centres submitted the two units on the same memory stick. This should not happen as both units must be kept separate in all respects, in case mark review for one or the other is required at a later stage.***

### **Administration**

Markers complain of: -

- poor labelling- or no labelling -of cassette or CD (most often)
- oral forms not submitted
- oral forms not filled in correctly by students
- oral forms not signed by candidate or examiner
- tapes/CD's not included
- out-of-date oral forms used
- issues expressed in English
- registers not submitted
- poor packaging – resulting in broken cassettes.

### **Conclusion**

Reports of this type can by definition be dispiriting. Undue emphasis appears to be placed on negative aspects. The remarks made here seek to inform and not to criticise. Better understanding of the requirements of the test will result in improved performance by candidates and better grades.

This unit is one of the most demanding tests faced by A level students. It is a test of knowledge and understanding, as is true of every A level subject, but it also contains performance elements of a very special nature – namely the ability to listen critically, analyse correctly and respond convincingly – immediately and in the face of close questioning. That so many candidates are able to do so is a credit to them and their schools and colleges.

***Centres are reminded of the Edexcel Notice to Centres on the website to inform them that **audio cassettes will no longer be accepted for assessment** after September 2014.***

### Unit 3: Understanding and Spoken Response

Marking guidance for oral examiners

#### Tests that are too short

A test is too short if it is less than 10 minutes 30 seconds. Candidates are allowed a 30 second tolerance.

The timing of the test begins the moment the candidate starts the presentation.

Drop down one mark band to the corresponding mark across the following assessment grids:

- 'Response'
- 'Comprehension and Development'

e.g.

5-8	Limited incidence of spontaneous discourse; limited range of lexis and structures; very little evidence of abstract language.
9-12	Satisfactory incidence of spontaneous discourse; range of lexis and structures adequate with some ability to handle language of abstract concepts.
13-16	Frequent examples of spontaneous discourse; good range of lexis and structures; good use of abstract concepts.

If a candidate would have scored 12, they should be given 8, if they would have scored 9, they should be given 5. This adjustment should not be applied to 'Quality of language' or 'Reading and research'.

#### Tests that are too long

Once the 13 minute mark has passed, the examiner stops listening at the end of the next sentence.

#### Tests that do not have a debatable or defensible issue

e.g. where the candidate does not present or defend a definite stance, or the teacher-examiner fails to give the candidate an opportunity to justify their opinions.

- Candidates will be limited to scoring a maximum of 4 for 'Reading and Research'.
- This may affect the marks given for 'Comprehension and Development'.

#### Tests that do not move away from initial issue/topic

e.g. further unpredictable areas of discussion are not covered and/or a monologue.

- Candidates are limited in the amount of marks they can score. Please see the grids.

Response	
Only one unpredictable area discussed	No more than 12 marks
No unpredictable areas discussed	No more than 8 marks

Reading and research	
Only one unpredictable area discussed	No more than 4 marks
No unpredictable areas discussed	No more than 3 marks

Comprehension and development	
Only one unpredictable area discussed	No more than 10 marks
No unpredictable areas discussed	No more than 7 marks

**Tests that are pre-learnt**

Pre-learnt is defined as a performance which is largely recited and may demonstrate very little spontaneity and impaired intonation. Candidates are limited in the amount of marks they can score. Please see 'Response' grid.

- 'Response' - cannot score more than 8, irrespective of use of lexis/structure/abstract language.

Pre-learnt tests may also affect the mark given for 'Comprehension and Development' if it does not permit a natural and logical interaction.



## **Grade Boundaries**

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:  
<http://www.edexcel.com/iwant to/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual  




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

