



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report Principal Examiner Feedback

October 2020

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level
In French (9FR0/02)
Paper 2: Written response to works and
translation

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by 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 or 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.

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

October 2018

Publications Code xxxxxxxx*

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

Although there were few candidates, the usual range of ability was evident. In spite of the small numbers, there was quite a good spread of take-up in the prescriptions. There was some coverage of 15 out of the 26 possibilities, albeit with only one or two essays on some of them. There were no unfinished or uneven scripts, an indication that the candidates had used the time available wisely and to sound effect.

Q1 proved to be very similar in outcome to previous series. The mean mark was 8.6 which is slightly higher than in earlier sessions with a larger candidature. The usual assessment methods concerning accents and slight misspellings were followed. Non-grammatical accents and those which do not change meaning were not taken into account. Tolerated misspellings do not apply to verb endings, agreements and gender. Misspellings which lead to an English word are not credited. In this passage this affected 'control' in box 3 and particularly 'environment' in the last snippet.

As always, some sections turned out to be especially challenging. These included on this occasion boxes 5, 7, 13, 17 and 18. The use of the subjunctive after a verb of wishing was problematic for just about everyone. Candidates tended to follow the English construction and produce something akin to *je ne voulais pas ma mère et mon père à se séparer*. Similarly, renderings of 'I was not asked' owed much to English with versions such as *je n'étais pas demandé*. Box 13 proved to be very elusive. Many candidates correctly used the subjunctive and one or two made the past participle agree. Surprisingly, the most common mistake here was to misplace the object pronoun. Many candidates succeeded with the second part of the Perfect Conditional construction (18) but few could give an accurate rendering of the first part in box 17. The Perfect Conditional was very often given in both parts of the construction. Use of the Pluperfect tense in box 17 was exceedingly rare.

On the other hand, a number of sections were found to be widely accessible and brought a pleasing amount of correct versions. This applied to boxes 1, 4, 6, 8, 11 and 16. One puzzling feature, however, was that 'Her new husband' was quite often given as *Son nouvel mari(e)*. Candidates also commonly followed *préfér  * with *de* in box 19, something which has been noted and commented on in previous sessions. Overall, the performance on Q1 was not dissimilar to that encountered in other years.

This translation gained a very good score of 16.

Quand deux parents décident qu'ils ne peuvent plus se supporter, leurs enfants n'ont
 aucun contrôle de la situation et peuvent souffrir. Par exemple, on ne m'a pas
 demandé, quand j'étais une petite fille de 5 ans, si je voulais que ma mère et
 mon père se séparent. Puis, trois ans plus tard, ma mère s'est remariée. Son
 nouveau mari avait deux fils adolescents qui sont venus habiter avec nous. Bien
 qu'ils m'aient toujours traitée d'une façon respectueuse avec du respect et de
 la considération, ^{parfois} je ne sens pas à l'aise parfois dans ma propre maison. Si j'aurais
 pu choisir, j'aurais préféré de grandir dans un environnement complètement
 différent.

This candidate demonstrated a good grasp of the most complex grammatical items. Unfortunately, the Passive construction in box 5 was just spoiled by a confusion of a preceding indirect object pronoun with a direct one, an understandable slip. In section 17 the tense in the si clause was incorrect and, like so many others, this candidate chose to follow *preferer* with *de*. Overall, however, this was a very creditable performance.

This translation gained an average score of 8.

Quand deux parents décident que ils ^{ne s'entendent pas de} ~~ne s'entendent~~
 bien, leur enfants ~~ont~~ ^{ne sont pas de} ~~sont atteints~~ aucun
 contrôle ^{du} ~~de~~ la situation et ils peuvent souffrir.
 Par ^{exemple} ~~exemple~~, j'~~ai~~ ^{ne} j'étais pas demandé,
 quand j'étais ~~jeune~~ ^{une} ~~jeune~~ fille jeune de
~~5~~ ⁵ ans, si j'ai voulu ^{ma mère et mon} ~~par ma mère et mon~~
^{père} ~~parents~~ à se séparer. ^{pu survenir,} ~~et~~ ^{plus tard} ~~plus tard~~
 ma mère a remarié. Son nouveau mari ~~est~~
~~avait~~ ^{adolescents} ~~avait~~ deux gars ^{qui} ~~qui~~ venus vivre
^{avec elle} ~~avec~~ nous. Bien que ils aient toujours
 me traité avec respect et considération,
 quelque ^{fois} ~~fois~~ sois, je ne sentis pas relaxé
 chez moi. Si ~~je~~ ^{j'aurais} ~~je~~ ~~je~~ je pouvais choisir
~~je~~ ^{j'aurais} ~~je~~ ~~je~~ j'aurais préféré élever dans un
~~environnement alternatif.~~ ~~environnement alternatif.~~ ^{environnement alternatif.}

The most demanding elements of grammar proved difficult for this candidate who gave many typical renderings. For example, the Passive construction given as *je n'étais pas demandé* and 'if I wanted my mother and father to separate' as *si j'ai voulu ma mère et mon père à se séparer*. An incorrect tense was used in box 17. Other features, such as a lack of concord, incorrect gender and misplaced pronouns also led to a loss of credit. *Suffrir* is a good example of a misspelling which can be tolerated, as it concerns the stem of the verb and not the ending. However, *une* environment can not be credited for two obvious reasons. Vocabulary in this passage caused candidates very few problems but *élever* cannot be accepted as a translation of 'grow up' in box 19. The translation is not, however, without its merits. Successful versions are given for sections 1, 4, 16 and 18 and there is a sustained correct sequence in the middle involving boxes 10 to 12. As always with an average piece of work, one is left with the impression that with a little more care a higher mark could have been quite easily achieved.

Performances in the essays were also quite varied. Candidates are advised to consider carefully the two alternatives available and to think carefully about the wording of the question before committing pen to paper. They are also reminded that all questions seek analysis and, therefore, pure narrative and/or description will not gain high reward.

Candidates invariably find questions on literary style, compared to those on cinematographic techniques, demanding. Essays on style tend to include one or possibly two salient points and then lapse into inappropriate narrative and description. There were two style questions on this occasion. One essay was seen on style in *La Place*. This was indifferent for the reasons just given. Surprisingly more candidates chose the style question on *L'Étranger* than the alternative. Some managed to mention the first person narrative and even the use of the *passé composé* but they could not evaluate the deployment of these. These candidates then reverted to rather aimless narrative. One cannot help but think that they would have been better served to choose the alternative question which was tackled satisfactorily by those who opted for it.

The wording of questions is often crucial. On *Intouchables* candidates were required to analyse the help given by Driss to others, *Philippe mis à part*. This wording could hardly be more explicit. In spite of this, a few candidates wrote at some length about the aid given to Philippe. Their essays were thus largely irrelevant and they did not score highly for Critical Analysis.

The mention of Hubert in Q21(b) led some candidates to embark on nothing other than a character study of this character: *Hubert est visualisée par le réalisateur comme un homme plus mûr et réfléchi que ceux qui l'entourer (sic)*. Those who did take cognisance of the mention of viewers in the question tended to say merely what information about Hubert people gained from watching the film. Any attempts to analyse viewers' reactions were implicit at the very most: *La salle du boxe implique l'opportunité pour Hubert de suivre un avenir dehors du cité et une évasion du crime et pauvreté qui l'accompagnent. Dans ce façon Kassovitz crée la chute d'Hubert*

envers le monde de violence plus déprimant, comme Hubert était le meilleur possibilité pour une échappatoire (sic). The candidate is perhaps saying that one is likely to be depressed but a comment on reactions is far from clear.

Some essays were very good. The question on the episode in the Hôtel Excelsior in *Un Sac de Billes* inevitably led to some story-telling but in this case candidates used the narrative to discuss the importance of this part of the novel. There was also a very perceptive essay on Cléo de 5 à 7. On *Les Mains Sales* candidates were asked to track the development of Hugo's feelings towards Hoederer. This was well done, including some good appreciation of the ending in which Hugo's final action was seen as a last result of his changing attitude to the assassinated political leader: Pour conclure, des sentiments d'Hugo envers Hoederer ont développé du début au fin de la pièce, de l'ignorance et l'indifférence à beaucoup de compréhension et affection (sic). All this had been shown earlier in the essay and had been illustrated with appropriate references to the play.

Thus, there was a variety of performance in the essays but in general the standard of attainment was certainly satisfactory and not unlike that found in previous series. This applied both to Critical Analysis and to the language in which the pieces were expressed.

