



**Pearson
Edexcel**

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2018

**Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level
In French Advanced Subsidiary (WFR03) Unit 1
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 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

Summer 2018

Publications Code WFR03_01_msc_20180815

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.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

IAL MFL
Advanced Level
Unit 3: Understanding and Spoken Response
Mark scheme

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

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

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

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

