



# General Certificate of Education

## French 5651

### *FR02 Aspects of Society*

# Mark Scheme

## *2006 examination - June series*

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

## Unit 2

	<b>% of AS</b>	<b>Marks</b>
AO2 Response to written language	10	18
AO3 Knowledge of grammar	5	9
AO4 Knowledge of society	30	27
<b>TOTAL</b>	30	54

### Annotation of Scripts

The following conventions will be used by examiners marking scripts:

<b>AO2</b> (Reaction and Response)	<b>AO4</b> (Content)
® written in the margin to indicate reaction/response relevant to AO2 where this includes reason/justification of opinion.	© written in the margin to indicate information relevant to AO4, derived from a source other than the current Preliminary Material and relevant to the question set.
R written in the margin to indicate reaction/response relevant to AO2 when no justification is given.	C written in the margin to indicate information relevant to AO4, derived from the Preliminary Material and relevant to the question set.
	T written in the margin to indicate information generally relevant to the topic.
Rep written in the margin to indicate repetition of information relevant to AO4 or AO2.	
Irr vertical line in the margin = irrelevant/inappropriate material.	

The mark for AO4, AO2 and AO3 respectively written at the foot of an answer accompanied, where the examiner deems it necessary, by a word or phrase quoted from the criteria for assessment as published in the specification.

## Question 1a

Décrivez deux médias français que vous avez étudiés. Qu'est-ce que vous pensez de ces médias et pourquoi?

C =	AO4 content from PM	R =	good AO2 point	T =	information about the topic
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Ⓜ =	justified AO2 point		
Rep =	repeated point	Irr =	irrelevant/incorrect material + vertical line in margin		

<b>A02</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	Descriptions of two media. Clear expression of views on those media <u>in France</u> .
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	Perhaps one media not well described. Views not fully explained. Perhaps a third media put in as support.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	Media too generalised (UK case perhaps). Too many different media as examples.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Mostly unspecific examples. Masses of media.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>A03</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

<b>A04</b>	<b>Content /Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• French press - regional strengths and national weaknesses</li> <li>• French television - examples of different programme styles [news reporting]</li> <li>• Cinema - cultural importance - artistic history - government commitment</li> <li>• Internet - all French examples - Quero, rival to Google? - links with francophonie</li> <li>• Other media? Make sure that the examples are French</li> </ul>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	

## Question 1b

« En France, on apprend et on communique mieux à cause d'Internet ». Commentez cette opinion en utilisant des exemples français.

C =	AO4 content from PM	R =	good AO2 point	T =	information about the topic
© =	AO4 content not from PM	® =	justified AO2 point		
Rep =	repeated point	Irr =	irrelevant/incorrect material + vertical line in margin		

<b>A02</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	Clear judgement on whether learning and communication is improved <u>in France</u> . Different judgements according to different audiences.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	Question focussed but differences glossed. Still an overall view taken.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	Simple yes/no answer. Evidence general/UK?
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>A03</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

<b>A04</b>	<b>Content /Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Age-related differences</li> <li>• Different learning/communication patterns across social groups</li> <li>• Understanding that Internet has had effects on other media [and touched learning/communication there too]</li> <li>• Good understanding of "better" and evidence for/against</li> </ul>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	

## Question 2a

Quels sont les grands problèmes de la pollution en France? A votre avis, comment la France peut-elle résoudre ces problèmes?

C =	AO4 content from PM	R =	good AO2 point	T =	information about the topic
© =	AO4 content not from PM	® =	justified AO2 point		
Rep =	repeated point	Irr =	irrelevant/incorrect material + vertical line in margin		

<b>A02</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	Identifies a range of different types of pollution in France. Clear on what can be done <u>realistically</u> .
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	Fewer pollution problems. Rather ambitious solutions offered. Still question focussed.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	Very few pollution examples given. Solutions highly dubious.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Maybe one pollution. Evidence probably general/ UK.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>A03</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

<b>A04</b>	<b>Content /Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air pollution with examples/information on extent of problem.</li> <li>• Pollution of water - industrial examples; <i>marées noires</i></li> <li>• Waste products - industrial/domestic - landfill/dumping/exporting.</li> <li>• Urban noise problems.</li> <li>• Controls of the above - examples of success - evidence of extent of differences to be made.</li> <li>• Use of less polluting energies -wind/wave/thermal.</li> <li>• Changing public attitudes - how?</li> <li>• EU legislation - waste control.</li> </ul>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	



## Question 2b

Quelles énergies renouvelables sont les plus employées en France? Croyez-vous que ces énergies vont avoir du succès en France? Pourquoi/pourquoi pas?

C =	AO4 content from PM	R =	good AO2 point	T =	information about the topic
© =	AO4 content not from PM	® =	justified AO2 point		
Rep =	repeated point	Irr =	irrelevant/incorrect material + vertical line in margin		

<b>A02</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	A range of different renewables used. Scales of use understood. Clear view on likely success.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	Energies named but not so clear on the scales of use. Evidence of likely success vague.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	Very much a list of energies without understanding relative worth. Very simple notions of success.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>A03</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

<b>A04</b>	<b>Content /Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in A02)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wind farms with figures from local areas.</li> <li>• Tidal schemes.</li> <li>• Solar examples.</li> <li>• Hydroelectric sources.</li> <li>• Biomass energy developments.</li> <li>• Geothermic options.</li> <li>• Evidence of growing take up/decline in interest.</li> <li>• Opposition groups' effectiveness.</li> <li>• Relative costs to oil/gas [impact on likely success].</li> </ul>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	

## Question 3a

Décrivez la diversité multiculturelle dans la société française. A votre avis, est-ce que cette diversité est bonne pour la France?

C =	AO4 content from PM	R =	good AO2 point	T =	information about the topic
© =	AO4 content not from PM	® =	justified AO2 point		
Rep =	repeated point	Irr =	irrelevant/incorrect material + vertical line in margin		

<b>A02</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	Very good definition of various multicultural models. Evidence of where/how they operate. Connects diversity to good/bad reactions. Clear view on benefit of diversity <u>to France</u> .
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	Tends not to give an overall view - isolated examples. Still plenty of personal reaction.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	Rather cluttered detail with little understanding of diversity. No real idea of whether <u>on the whole</u> France benefits.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>A03</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

<b>A04</b>	<b>Content /Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integration/separation models.</li> <li>• The "two Frances" - impact of urban unemployment on racial tensions - Clichy sous Bois.</li> <li>• Political reactions - Sarkozy - impact on public opinion - weak, white state.</li> <li>• Benefits of immigration - cultural benefits of migrant francophones - music/cuisine/religion.</li> <li>• Lay state contrasts and conflicts.</li> <li>• "Frenchness" in conflict with the Moslem heritage - Chirac's reaction.</li> <li>• Power/impact of FN.</li> </ul>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	

## Question 3b

A votre avis, les immigrés en France, sont-ils bien traités? Donnez des exemples.

C =	AO4 content from PM	R =	good AO2 point	T =	information about the topic
© =	AO4 content not from PM	® =	justified AO2 point		
Rep =	repeated point	Irr =	irrelevant/incorrect material + vertical line in margin		

<b>A02</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	Defines immigrants [generations 2/3 or not]. Good explanation of how and where they are well/not well treated. Splits up answer into pertinent fields. French views quantified. Overall conclusion reached.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	Perhaps a more general answer. Tends to imply rather than make an overall conclusion. Still task focussed.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	On topic, but rather vague and/or polarised with little explanation. Assumptions made about who is treated well/badly. Narrative of events.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>A03</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

<b>A04</b>	<b>Content /Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who are the immigrants/how numerous are they/where do they go?</li> <li>• Who treats them well/badly and where/when/why?</li> <li>• Clichy sous Bois example.</li> <li>• The police - friend or foe?</li> <li>• The political establishment view - the CPE.</li> <li>• World of work - a fair treatment?</li> <li>• Religious tolerance - the lay state.</li> <li>• The contrasting welcome in sport.</li> </ul>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	

## Question 4a

Quelles sont les possibilités offertes aux Français par l'Union Européenne? A votre avis, est-ce que l'Europe est populaire en France? Pourquoi/pourquoi pas?

C =	AO4 content from PM	R =	good AO2 point	T =	information about the topic
© =	AO4 content not from PM	® =	justified AO2 point		
Rep =	repeated point	Irr =	irrelevant/incorrect material + vertical line in margin		

<b>A02</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	Very good descriptions may analyse the political, cultural and social impact of the EU on France. Who favours/does not favour Europe - with reasons given.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	Perhaps tends to generalise too much, but still uses the key evidence to reach a conclusion.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	Very much a patchy performance tending to understand limited possibilities. Reasons weak.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>A03</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

<b>A04</b>	<b>Content /Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The referendum on the proposed constitution.</li> <li>• The PAC.</li> <li>• Travel, education and business movements.</li> <li>• The burden on the tax-payer.</li> <li>• Scandals and malpractice.</li> <li>• Political/historical commitments to Europe.</li> <li>• Commitments to human rights.</li> <li>• The changing, East-centred Europe - threat or opportunity?</li> <li>• Counter-balance to American influences</li> <li>• Turkey ?</li> </ul>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	



## Question 4b

Quelle est l'attitude des Français envers l'Union Européenne? Utilisez des exemples tirés de vos études.

C =	AO4 content from PM	R =	good AO2 point	T =	information about the topic
© =	AO4 content not from PM	® =	justified AO2 point		
Rep =	repeated point	Irr =	irrelevant/incorrect material + vertical line in margin		

<b>A02</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	Who favours/does not favour Europe - with reasons given. Explanations of the patterns of support/lack of support.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	Perhaps tends to generalise too much, but still uses the key evidence to reach a conclusion.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	Very much a patchy performance tending to understand limited attitudes. Reasons weak.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>A03</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

<b>A04</b>	<b>Content /Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The referendum on the proposed constitution.</li> <li>• The PAC - views on.</li> <li>• The burden on the tax-payer.</li> <li>• Scandals and malpractice - effects</li> <li>• Political/historical commitments to Europe.</li> <li>• Commitments to human rights.</li> <li>• The changing, East-centred Europe - threat or opportunity?</li> <li>• Counter-balance to American influences</li> <li>• Turkey ?</li> </ul>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	

## Question 5a

Qu'est-ce que c'est la francophonie? A votre avis, quels sont ses aspects les plus importants?

C =	AO4 content from PM	R =	good AO2 point	T =	information about the topic
© =	AO4 content not from PM	® =	justified AO2 point		
Rep =	repeated point	Irr =	irrelevant/incorrect material + vertical line in margin		

<b>A02</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	Very good understanding that <i>la francophonie</i> works on cultural, social, linguistic and political levels. A firm judgement about the most important aspects.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	Perhaps rather ignores one or more level. Less clear differentiation between aspects.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	Muddled understanding of term. Not clear on relative importances. Too much specific evidence?
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>A03</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

<b>A04</b>	<b>Content /Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The French language as "cultural/political/sporting cement".</li> <li>• TV5</li> <li>• International bodies - medical examples - the Olympic movement.</li> <li>• The Dom-Tom and colonies.</li> <li>• Film/the Arts - links to the Maghreb.</li> <li>• The fight against the Anglo-Saxon world - Chirac and English.</li> </ul>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internet : Quaero, rival to Google?</li> </ul>
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	

## Question 5b

Est-ce qu'on gagne ou est-ce qu'on perd la bataille du français dans le monde? Comment et pourquoi?

C =	AO4 content from PM	R =	good AO2 point	T =	information about the topic
© =	AO4 content not from PM	® =	justified AO2 point		
Rep =	repeated point	Irr =	irrelevant/incorrect material + vertical line in margin		

<b>A02</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	Good understanding of the areas where French is strong and those where it is threatened by other languages, notably English. A good description of the changing role of French and a personal view about winning/losing.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	Key points about French and its use in the world but less convincing on the current trend - is it up/down and where/how?
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	Too general. Probably too much evidence without linking themes/trends. No real view given.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>A03</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

<b>A04</b>	<b>Content /Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• French in the political world - "the old Europe" versus "the new".</li> <li>• TV5</li> <li>• French in the Arts - cinema/literature. A cultural power still?</li> <li>• French in the world - other languages taking over or French surging on?</li> <li>• French in Europe - the new eastern centre.</li> <li>• The power of English. Chirac and Google.</li> <li>• English in the French business world - battle being lost or won?</li> </ul>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	