



Pearson

# Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2018

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level  
In French Advanced Subsidiary (WFR03) Unit 3  
Understanding and Spoken Response

## **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](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)

January 2018

Publications Code WFR03\_01\_1801\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.

## Marking Guidance for Oral Examiners

### Tests that are too short

A test is too short if it is less than 10 minutes 30 seconds (this includes a 30 second tolerance) from when the candidate starts the presentation.

In fairness to all candidates, tests which are too short cannot be deemed to demonstrate the full requirements of the mark grids for *Accuracy* and *Spontaneity and development*.

The procedure followed is:

If, for example, a candidate were deemed to have scored 10 for *Spontaneity and development* based on performance in an oral which is too short, then the corresponding mark in the band immediately below would be awarded to reflect this reduced length. In this case the candidate would be awarded 5.

The same procedure would be followed for *Accuracy*.

### Test that are too long

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

### Selection of presentation issues

Candidates must have selected an issue that can be debated, and not only discussed, with the candidate taking a definite stance. Issues that cannot be debated will lead to candidates being unable to demonstrate the top achievement in *Reading and research*. Such candidates will not have been given the opportunity to demonstrate sufficient breadth and detail to achieve higher than 3 marks.

### Evidence of Reading and research

The specification clearly states that candidates will be assessed on the breadth and depth of their research in the presentation/debate in Section A and, as such, **must** mention newspaper/magazine articles (and/or other written materials) in order to demonstrate the achievement of the top mark bands (4 and 5).

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

*i.e. further unpredictable areas of discussion are not covered.*

Candidates are limited in the number of marks they can achieve. Please see the grids.

<b>Spontaneity and development</b>	
Only <b>one</b> unpredictable area discussed	No more than 15 marks
No unpredictable areas discussed	No more than 10 marks

<b>Critical analysis</b>	
Only <b>one</b> unpredictable area discussed	No more than 3 marks
No unpredictable areas discussed	No more than 2 marks

## **Spontaneity**

To access a mark band of 11 or above candidates must demonstrate **many** examples of spontaneous responses to questions.

- 'Many' implies that spontaneity is a clear characteristic of the test. The candidate would be unlikely to demonstrate spontaneity with material which is largely recited.

Spontaneity occurs when candidates use their knowledge of structures and lexis and apply it appropriately in response to unpredictable, but not unfamiliar, questions.

The unpredictability is created by the teacher/examiner responding to the candidates' views to elicit development. Unpredictability on the part of the teacher/examiner will facilitate an appropriate level of spontaneity.

Fluent discourse refers to a natural conversation within the context of an assessment. Discourse describes the exchange of opinion and information on an issue between the candidate and the teacher/examiner. In practice, this means that each participant addresses the points made by the other.

## **Development**

Development means appropriately expanding on an idea and point of view. This can be in the form of justification, illustration, exemplification, clarification, comparison of the candidates' ideas and views.

## Assessment Criteria

Mark	Reading and research (Debate only): AO2
0	No rewardable material.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Scant evidence of any reading and research into the chosen issue.</li><li>• Very superficial.</li></ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Little evidence of reading and research into the chosen issue.</li><li>• Obvious gaps and very little detail.</li></ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Adequate evidence of reading and research into the chosen issue but overall lacks breadth and detail.</li><li>• Somewhat inconsistent.</li></ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Good to very good evidence of wide reading and research into the chosen issue with occasional gaps.</li><li>• Some pertinent detail at times.</li></ul>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Excellent evidence of in-depth and very wide reading and research into the chosen issue.</li><li>• Excellent detail.</li></ul>

Mark	Quality of language (Range of lexis): AO3
0	No rewardable material.
1	Very basic lexis; minimal command of structure.
2	Lexis restricted; operates generally in simple sentences.
3	Adequate range of lexis; limited range of structures.
4	Good range of lexis with some examples of more complex structures.
5	Wide range of lexis and good variety of structures with only occasional limitation.

Mark	Quality of language (Accuracy): AO3
0	No rewardable material.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Isolated examples of correct language.</li> <li>• Poor pronunciation and intonation.</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many basic errors, often impeding communication.</li> <li>• Pronunciation and intonation, not always comprehensible.</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accuracy variable, basic errors sometimes impede communication.</li> <li>• Pronunciation and intonation comprehensible.</li> </ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally accurate but some errors in more complex language, communication rarely impeded.</li> <li>• Pronunciation and intonation generally good.</li> </ul>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highly accurate but not necessarily error-free.</li> <li>• Pronunciation and intonation authentic.</li> </ul>

Mark	Spontaneity and development: AO1
0	No rewardable material.
1 - 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimal spontaneity.</li> <li>• Cannot develop responses.</li> <li>• Often fails to respond or needs regular prompting.</li> <li>• Very reliant on examiner's language.</li> </ul>
6 - 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some examples of spontaneity.</li> <li>• Limited development of responses.</li> <li>• Some hesitation in more complex areas.</li> <li>• Difficulty with some questions.</li> </ul>
11 - 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many examples of spontaneity.</li> <li>• Some development of responses.</li> <li>• Responds usually without undue hesitation.</li> <li>• Deals adequately in most situations.</li> </ul>
16 - 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High incidence of spontaneous, fluent discourse.</li> <li>• Detailed development of responses.</li> <li>• Able to respond readily to all questions.</li> <li>• Develops and sustains discourse well.</li> </ul>

Mark	Critical analysis: AO4
0	No rewardable material.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only superficial engagement with key issues.</li> <li>• Limited links between ideas, leading to limited coherence throughout.</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partial explanations of key issues.</li> <li>• Occasional links between ideas and some attempts to justify these.</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full explanation of key issues.</li> <li>• Some justified links between ideas, and coherent arguments are sometimes present.</li> </ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A critical analysis of key issues, albeit inconsistent.</li> <li>• Justified links between ideas, with coherent arguments mostly present that show a developing individual response.</li> </ul>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A full evaluation of key issues.</li> <li>• Consistently justified links between ideas, often well substantiated with insightful observations that form a well-rounded individual response.</li> </ul>



