

Combined Mark Schemes and Report on the Units

June 2005

3861/7861/MS/R/05

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2005

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annersley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE French (7861)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE French (3861)

MARK SCHEMES FOR THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
2651A/B/C	French: Speaking	1
2652	French: Listening, Reading and Writing 1	9
2653	French: Reading and Writing	17
2654A/C	French: Speaking and Reading	23
2655	French: Listening, Reading and Writing 2	29
2656	French: Culture and Society (Written Paper)	41

REPORT ON THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
2651A/B/C	French: Speaking	49
2652	French: Listening, Reading and Writing 1	57
2653	French: Reading and Writing	64
2654A/C	French: Speaking and Reading	68
2655	French: Listening, Reading and Writing 2	75
2656	French: Culture and Society (Written Paper)	82
2657	French: Culture and Society (Coursework)	92
*	Grade Thresholds	98

Mark Scheme 2651/01/02/03
June 2005

Marking Scheme: Unit 2651 (French)
Components 01, 02 and 03: Speaking

Total: 60 marks**Section A Role-play**

Response to written text	5 marks (AO2)	[Grid 1A]
Response to Examiner	5 marks (AO1)	[Grid 1B]
Quality of Language	5 marks (AO3)	[Grid 1C]

Section B

Topic presentation	20 marks (AO4)	[Grid 1D]
Topic discussion		
Spontaneity and fluency	15 marks (AO1)	[Grid 1E]
Pronunciation and intonation	5 marks (AO1)	[Grid 1F]
Quality of Language	5 marks (AO3)	[Grid 1C]

Section A Role-play: Grids 1A and 1B**10 marks****Grid 1A: Response to written text****0-1 Very Poor**

Little use made of stimulus material. Supplies one or two of the key points, but with many gaps and no detail.

2 Poor

Some attempt made to use the stimulus material, but covers fewer than half the key points. Many omissions or points not conveyed clearly.

3 Adequate

Performance is inconsistent. Makes a reasonable attempt to use the stimulus material. Covers about half of the key points, but there are some gaps.

4 Good

Makes good use of stimulus material. Covers over half the key points with some detail, but does not extend quite far enough to qualify for Very Good.

5 Very Good

Makes full use of the stimulus material. Covers virtually all the key points clearly supported by detail.

Grid 1B: Response to Examiner**0-1 Very Poor**

Barely able to respond to many of the Examiner's questions. Shows very little initiative or imagination. Unable to react to Examiner's comments.

2 Poor

Some attempt to carry out the task but with limited success. Responses to the Examiner frequently inadequate. Shows little initiative or imagination.

3 Adequate

Inconsistent. Responds satisfactorily to the Examiner, but does not extend a great deal. Some quite good replies but some omissions.

4 Good

Completes the task successfully, showing initiative and imagination most of the time. Is able to keep the momentum going. Extends quite well, but could have gone a little further.

5 Very Good

Completes the task successfully, responding fully to the Examiner's questions and showing initiative and imagination throughout. Takes charge of the conversation. A convincing performance.

Grid 1C: Quality of Language**5 marks****0-1 Very Poor**

Little evidence of grammatical awareness. Persistent serious and elementary errors. Only simplest sentence patterns.

2 Poor

Evidence of gaps in basic grammar. Frequent errors of an elementary kind, e.g irregular verbs frequently not known. Some attempt at use of subordinate clauses and more complex sentence patterns, but errors still, even in common structures.

3 Adequate

Shows evidence of fair understanding of grammatical usage but performance is likely to be patchy and inconsistent. Attempts more complex language but not always successfully. Expression rather forced and problems with correct word order.

4 Good

Accuracy generally good. Shows sound grasp of AS structures list. Tenses and agreements sound although there may be errors in more complex areas. Ambitious in use of complex sentence patterns but not always able to maintain correct usage.

5 Very Good

High and consistent level of accuracy. Only minor errors and slips. Confident and correct use of a range of structures.

Section B**45 marks****Topic presentation: Grid 1D****20 marks**

Note: The Examiner awards a mark for this grid on the basis of candidates' presentations. Candidates are initially placed in the middle of the mark band, which is considered to be appropriate to their performance in the presentation. Following the subsequent discussion the mark may be adjusted within the band or even into a higher or lower band.

Note that it is not possible to be specific in the following grid because of the diversity of topics presented. The Examiner should adapt the general statements below to the specific topic being addressed. Grid 1D focuses on (i) knowledge and factual information; (ii) evidence of planning and preparation; (iii) quality of exposition and presentation. Other issues, such as ideas, opinions and the ability to enter into debate about the topic are dealt with when assessing the discussion (see Grid 1E).

0-4 Very Poor

Conveys very little information about the subject. Material very thin and vague. Much waffle or superficiality. Gives the appearance of not having studied the subject seriously, and not to have planned with care. Poor and hesitant presentation.

5-8 Poor

Little information beyond the obvious or commonplace. Material thin, rambling, repetitious. Some evidence of planning and preparation, but presentation is pedestrian.

9-12 Adequate

Solid base of information with evidence of preparation and planning. Material is factually adequate, but with no evidence of wider reading. Material may not always be relevant. Exposition of topic is worthy but somewhat stilted.

13-16 Good

Good exposition and sound organisation of the topic. Makes relevant factual points. Well-informed with a range of relevant factual information. Well planned and organised material. Good exposition of topic.

17-20 Very Good

Shows well-informed and consistently well-illustrated factual knowledge of the subject. Knowledge is allied to a clear grasp of the subject and understanding of the context and wider issues. Detailed planning evident and topic presented with style and flair.

Note: If candidates fail to relate the Presentation/Discussion to aspects of the society or culture of the country or community where the language is spoken, the maximum mark that can be achieved is 8/20 on Grid 1D.

If, in response to the Examiner's questions, there is some superficial reference subsequently made then this could rise to a maximum of 9/20. If more than a

superficial reference is made, the full range of marks in the Adequate band can be accessed.

Topic discussion: Grids 1E, 1F and 1C **25 marks**

Grid 1E: Spontaneity and fluency **15 marks**

0-3 Very Poor

Has very little to offer by way of ideas and opinions. Much irrelevance or superficiality. Cannot really cope with Examiner's non-factual questions. Slow, with frequent pauses. Fluency confined to pre-learnt material.

4-6 Poor

Beginning to develop ideas and opinions, but very patchy. Can respond intelligently to a few of Examiner's non-factual questions. Beginnings of fluency but with some inconsistency or hesitancy.

7-10 Adequate

Shows some ability to develop ideas and opinions and can respond intelligently to a number of the Examiner's non-factual questions. Reasonably fluent and spontaneous.

11-13 Good

Increasing ability to develop ideas and opinions. Can respond intelligently to almost all the Examiner's non-factual questions. Fluent and spontaneous much of the time.

14-15 Very Good

Able to develop ideas and opinions well. A very fluent and spontaneous performance throughout.

Grid 1F: Pronunciation and intonation**5 marks****0-1 Poor**

Only comprehensible with difficulty. Heavily influenced by mother tongue. Many sounds mispronounced.

2-3 Adequate

A number of errors, with particular problems with more difficult sounds. Otherwise intonation and pronunciation mostly acceptable.

4 Good

Pronunciation and intonation mostly correct, although there may be occasional mispronunciation with more difficult sounds.

5 Very Good

Only occasional errors of pronunciation and intonation. Sounds authentic most of the time.

Grid 1C: Quality of Language**5 marks****0-1 Very Poor**

Little evidence of grammatical awareness. Persistent serious and elementary errors. Only simplest sentence patterns.

2 Poor

Evidence of gaps in basic grammar. Frequent errors of an elementary kind, e.g irregular verbs frequently not known. Some attempt at use of subordinate clauses and more complex sentence patterns, but errors still, even in common structures.

3 Adequate

Shows evidence of fair understanding of grammatical usage but performance is likely to be patchy and inconsistent. Attempts more complex language but not always successfully. Expression rather forced and problems with correct word order.

4 Good

Accuracy generally good. Shows sound grasp of AS structures list. Tenses and agreements sound although there may be errors in more complex areas. Ambitious in use of complex sentence patterns but not always able to maintain correct usage.

5 Very Good

High and consistent level of accuracy. Only minor errors and slips. Confident and correct use of a range of structures.

**Mark Scheme 2652
June 2005**

Tâche 1 – 1 mark for each correct answer

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1 | B |
| 2 | A |
| 3 | C |
| 4 | B |
| 5 | C |
| 6 | B |
| 7 | C |
| 8 | B |
| 9 | A |
| 10 | C |

Tâche 2 – 1 mark for each correct answer

- | | |
|----|-------------------|
| 1 | No mark - example |
| 2 | V |
| 3 | PM |
| 4 | F |
| 5 | F |
| 6 | V |
| 7 | PM |
| 8 | F |
| 9 | PM |
| 10 | V |
| 11 | PM |

Tâche 3 – 1 mark for each correct answer

- | | |
|----|-------------------|
| 1 | D |
| 12 | No mark – example |
| 2 | H |
| 3 | E |
| 4 | O |
| 5 | A |
| 6 | I |
| 7 | J |
| 8 | P |
| 9 | K |
| 10 | N |

Tâche 4 - Section 2A

COMMENTS / NOTES

		General :	Do NOT penalise transcription of possessive pronouns/adjectives from tape
1	1	15.30	
2	1	B (12)	
3	1	A (librairie)	As stamps are also sold, <i>Bureau de Poste</i> is acceptable. So, accept B but max. 2 marks for question. Any 2, therefore, from A, B or D.
	1	D (snack bar)	
4	1	(Pour)(le) journal (régional)	Ignore <i>écrire / travailler</i>
	1	(Chez) un vétérinaire	Must have 4 syllables and vet + vowel + r
5	1	a Si on peut allonger(la durée) des séjours	<u>Insist on</u> idea of possibility <u>Not</u> <i>dallonger</i> <u>Not</u> <i>jours</i>
	1	b il faut plus d'une semaine / il faut plusieurs / quelques semaines	<u>Not</u> <i>beaucoup de semaines</i> Bracket out attempts to render "Selon les employeurs" if does not interfere with meaning
	1	<u>pour</u> bénéficier de l'expérience	Do not penalise omission of <u>pour</u> twice
	1	<u>pour</u> s'adapter au travail (any 2 out of 3)	Concept of students adapting needed. <u>Not</u> <i>s'adapter le travail</i>
6	1	a (parce qu') ils ont offert deux postes Ils font/ils ont/il y a 2 postes	<u>Not</u> 2 postes (t.c.) Reject <i>monter/montrer/also faire</i> except in <u>vont faire</u>
	1	b Ce sont des emplois à risques / il y a des risques	<u>Not</u> risk Concept of job being risky even if word <i>job</i> not used (e.g. <i>il y a des risques</i>) Verb or <i>à cause de + risque</i> needed
	1	Les stagiaires devraient / doivent (peut-être) être assurés	Concept of <u>need</u> for <u>insurance</u>
7	1	Ils ne reçoivent/recevront rien or ils ne sont/seront pas payés / rémunérés	<u>Not</u> <i>monnaie</i>
8	1	(Quelle est / sera / serait) la position du lycée	<u>Not</u> <i>lisser / z ; licé</i> <u>Not</u> <i>situation / situé</i>
	1	si des employeurs voulaient donner / donnaient une prime aux stagiaires.	Concept of bonus being given to the students

Grid 2A: Listening

0-1	<i>Very Poor</i>	Little evidence of grammatical awareness. Persistent serious and elementary errors in spelling, agreements and transcriptions from the spoken word.
2	<i>Poor</i>	Evidence of gaps in basic grammar. Frequent errors of an elementary kind, in spelling, agreements and transcriptions from the spoken word
3	<i>Adequate</i>	Shows evidence of fair understanding of grammatical usage but performance is likely to be patchy and inconsistent. Still recurrent errors in spelling, agreements and transcriptions from the spoken word.
4	<i>Good</i>	Accuracy generally quite consistent, but there may be errors in more complex area and/or a number of minor errors in spelling in transcriptions from the spoken word.
5	<i>Very Good</i>	High and consistent level of accuracy. Only minor errors and slips. Confident and correct use of a range of structures. Virtually no problems in transcriptions from the spoken word.

Task 2A has 4 non-verbal marks out of 15

n→ i↓	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
5	5	4	4	3	3	2	2	1	1	0	0
4	4	3	3	3	2	2	1	1	1	0	0
3	3	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	0
2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

i is the initial mark awarded for quality of language under Grid 2A.

n is the total number of marks for language-productive questions **not attempted** by the candidate.

Tâche 5: Section 2B

1 mark for each component, up to the maximum for each paragraph. The total for each paragraph is to be divided by 2. No rounding up at end of this task.

1	<p>1 As you know,</p> <p>1 cycling (tours) give a chance</p> <p>1 to get away from routine</p> <p>1 (and) this goes / is true</p> <p>1 for pupils and teachers</p> <p>1 What could be <u>more</u> attractive / better than is there anything as attractive as</p> <p>1 an excursion with a theme</p> <p>1 which allows a combination of / to mix</p> <p>1 sport, leisure/hobbies and education</p> <p>1 provided, (of course that)</p> <p>1 it has been <u>thoroughly / well</u> prepared (beforehand)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(any up to max 10)</p>	<p>Addition of walks / walking invalidates</p> <p>Valuable</p> <p>Comparison needed</p> <p>Associating <u>with</u></p> <p>Specific types of education</p> <p>Well understood</p>
2	<p>1 Over the years,</p> <p>1 we have put together / devised / perfected / designed</p> <p>1 <u>a range / series</u> of documents</p> <p>1 (designed) to help organizers</p> <p>1 in their preparation.</p> <p>1 At a small cost,</p> <p>1 we can give / supply you with</p> <p>1 (a series of) <u>technical</u> (information) leaflets</p> <p>1 giving advice / information on</p> <p>1 cycle maintenance</p> <p>1 safety / protective equipment</p>	<p><u>Not</u> some</p> <p><u>Not</u> disposition</p> <p>Accept forms</p> <p>Protection t.c.</p>

	1	(as well as on) highway regulations.	Not circulation. Accept traffic rules / rules of the road / Highway Code Accept variable distances
	1	We (also) have a (whole) range of itineraries	
	1	of varying lengths / distances	
	1	to match (the) age	
	1	and proficiency / skills / level (of the participants).	
		(any up to max 14)	
3	1	Whatever the length of a tour / trip	Responsible people invalidates
	1	its success	
	1	depends on the (degree of) preparation	
	1	of its organizers / leaders and support / accompanying staff.	
	1	We would like to point out that	
	1	we (regularly) run / organize training courses	
	1	(aiming) to develop (support staff's) awareness / show / educate people about	
	1	of the <u>demands</u> of this type of activity.	
		(any up to max 6)	

Grid 2B: Quality of Written English

0-1	<i>Very Poor</i>	Major and persistent errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
2	<i>Poor</i>	Frequent serious errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
3	<i>Adequate</i>	Still a number of errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling, some of them serious.
4	<i>Good</i>	Very accurate with only a few minor errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
5	<i>Very Good</i>	Excellent, almost faultless grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Tâche 6: Section 2C

½ mark to be deducted for each sub-component that has not been attempted.

1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would like to organise a trip next summer • We would be grateful for their support 	
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are interested in their training sessions • We would like details 	
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What pupil/staff ratio • is required by law? 	
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it possible to hire bikes? • How do we do it? 	
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do pupils have to supply • their own safety equipment 	

Work to be assessed for quality of language – **Grid 2C**

0-2	<i>Very Poor</i>	Little evidence of grammatical awareness. Persistent serious and elementary errors in endings, tenses, genders. Only simplest sentence patterns and those mainly incorrect.
3-4	<i>Poor</i>	Evidence of gaps in basic grammar. Frequent errors of an elementary kind, e.g. irregular verbs frequently not known; adjectival agreements and common genders faulty. Some attempt at use of subordinate clauses and more complex sentence patterns, but errors still, even in common structures.
5-6	<i>Adequate</i>	Shows evidence of fair understanding of grammatical usage but performance is likely to be patchy and inconsistent. Attempts more complex language and shows some ability to produce syntax and structures appropriate to the task but work is characterised by being inconsistent and with variable accuracy. Expression rather forced and problems with correct word order.
7-8	<i>Good</i>	Accuracy generally consistent. Shows sound grasp of AS and/or A2 structures list. Tenses and agreements sound although there may be some inconsistency and errors in more complex areas. Ambitious in use of a variety of complex sentence patterns but not always able to maintain correct usage.
9-10	<i>Very Good</i>	High and consistent level of accuracy. Mainly minor errors. The overall impression is one of competence. Confident and correct use of a varied range of structures.

**Mark Scheme 2653
June 2005**

Tâche 1. One mark per correct tick. If more than 8 are ticked, -1 for each additional tick

	Au Limonaire	L'Attrail	Le vieux Belleville	Chez Adel
a.				√
b.		√		√
c.			√	
d.	√			
e.	√	√		
f.			√	

Tâche 2.

- 1) B
- 2) A
- 3) B
- 4) C
- 5) C
- 6) A
- 7) C

Tâche 3.

Points could include :

- a) increase area of apartment / home
will put space to park car in individual flats
plus office and/or workshop and games room
staircases and pedestrian lifts will remain /
there will be / traditional access
add entrance halls big enough for (large) cars
vehicle lifts
with glass windows
- b) could work from home
use car as (mobile) office
transporting children will be easier (any reason
allowed)
easier to unload car after doing the shopping
and when returning from holiday / or loading
when leaving for holidays
don't need car park provided
or to spend hours looking for parking space
(idea of problem / time / difficulty)
no cross children in the car
no need to empty car in the evening(s) /
improved security
DIY / crafts will be easier
better for children because of games room

REJECT :

house
il veut construire un stationnement voiture,
t.c.

montrer (for monter)

loading on return

Marks are applied :

10 marks for quality of language	Grid 3A
10 marks for summary	Grid 3B
10 marks for personal response	Grid 3C

Tâche 4

- a) B
b) B
c) C
d) C
e) A
f) B
g) C
h) A
i) A
j) C
k) A
l) B
m) A
n) C
o) A

Grid 3A: Quality of Language

10 marks

0-2	<i>Very Poor</i>	Little evidence of grammatical awareness. Persistent serious and elementary errors in endings, tenses, genders. Only simplest sentence patterns, and those mainly incorrect.
3-4	<i>Poor</i>	Evidence of gaps in basic grammar. Frequent errors of an elementary kind, e.g. irregular verbs frequently not known; adjectival agreements and common genders faulty. Some attempt at use of subordinate clauses and more complex sentence patterns, but errors still, even in common structures.
5-6	<i>Adequate</i>	Shows evidence of fair understanding of grammatical usage but performance is likely to be patchy and inconsistent. Attempts more complex language and shows some ability to produce syntax and structures appropriate to the task but work is characterised by being inconsistent and with variable accuracy. Expression rather forced and problems with correct word order.
7-8	<i>Good</i>	Accuracy generally consistent. Shows sound grasp of AS and/or A2 structures list. Tenses and agreements sound although there may be some inconsistency and errors in more complex areas. Ambitious in use of a variety of complex sentence patterns but not always able to maintain correct usage.
9-10	<i>Very Good</i>	High and consistent level of accuracy. Mainly minor errors. The overall impression is one of competence. Confident and correct use of a varied range of structures.

NOTE

'L' indicates particularly good use of language

Grids 3B and 3C**20 marks**

These two grids should be applied jointly to the assessment of the candidate's work. For example, a candidate might omit any significant reference to the passage and yet provide an imaginative response to the theme of the text. The best candidates score highly on each grid.

Grid 3B: Comprehension**10 marks**

This grid is intended to assess the candidate's comprehension of the contents of the text. This grid should be read in conjunction with the setter's mark scheme for the paper, which indicates the list of points considered as forming the essential content indicating comprehension of the passage.

0		Work undeserving of any marks (e.g. blank, irrelevant).
1-2	<i>Very Poor</i>	Includes only one or two points from the original passage.
3-4	<i>Poor</i>	Merely transcribes sections from the original passage.
5-6	<i>Adequate</i>	Includes a reasonable number of points from the original passage.
7-8	<i>Good</i>	Includes a good number of points from the original passage.
9-10	<i>Very Good</i>	Provides a comprehensive summary of the original passage.

Grid 3C: Response

10 marks

0		No attempt to provide a personal response.
1-2	<i>Very Poor</i>	Only briefly indicates a personal opinion.
3-4	<i>Poor</i>	Two or three personal opinions indicate the beginnings of a response.
5-6	<i>Adequate</i>	A number of personal views expressed, but little flair or imagination.
7-8	<i>Good</i>	A range of personal views, with a certain originality and imagination.
9-10	<i>Very Good</i>	Responds with a wide range of views which show insight and imagination.

**Mark Scheme 2654
June 2005**

Section A: Discussion of article: Grids 4A and 4B 20 marks**Grid 4A: Response to and understanding of article
10 marks**

0-2	<i>Very poor</i>	Minimal understanding shown of article. Ideas largely superficial.
3-4	<i>Poor</i>	Limited knowledge shown of article. Considerable gaps in understanding.
5-6	<i>Adequate</i>	A reasonable level of understanding. Needs encouragement to develop ideas.
7-8	<i>Good</i>	Article generally well understood, but ideas rather limited.
9-10	<i>Very Good</i>	Excellent understanding of all aspects of the article.

Grid 4B: Comprehension of and response to Examiner 10 marks

0-2	<i>Very Poor</i>	Severe problems of comprehension. Very marked hesitation. Limited responsiveness.
3-4	<i>Poor</i>	Has general difficulty in understanding. Limited response to the majority of topics raised.
5-6	<i>Adequate</i>	Understands questions on basic concepts but has difficulty with more complicated ideas. Some delay in response.
7-8	<i>Good</i>	Few problems of comprehension. Responds readily and without undue hesitation. Quite forthcoming.
9-10	<i>Very Good</i>	No problems of comprehension. Prompt response to questions. Takes initiative in developing themes.

Section B: General conversation: Grids 4C, 1F, 4D and 4E 40 marks**Grid 4C: Spontaneity, comprehension, responsiveness, fluency 15 marks**

0-3	<i>Very poor</i>	Severe problems of comprehension. Very marked hesitation. Limited responsiveness. No fluency or feel for the language.
4-6	<i>Poor</i>	Has general difficulty in understanding. Limited response to questions on majority of topics raised. Little fluency or feel for the language. Translates literally from the mother tongue.
7-10	<i>Adequate</i>	Understands questions on basic situations and concepts but has difficulty with more complicated ideas. Some delay in response. Needs encouragement to develop topics. Reasonable fluency and feel for the language with occasional use of relevant idiom. Limited expression of ideas.
11-13	<i>Good</i>	Few problems of comprehension. Responds readily and without undue hesitation. Reasonably forthcoming but tends to follow examiner's lead. Good fluency and feel for the language. Shows competent use of relevant idiom.
14-15	<i>Very Good</i>	No problems of comprehension. Prompt response to examiner's questions. Very forthcoming in developing topics. Able to guide the discussion and lead the examiner, offering and seeking opinions as appropriate. Very good feel for the language and is able to express concepts fluently and in the appropriate idiom.

Grid 1F: Pronunciation and intonation**5 marks**

0-1	<i>Poor</i>	Only comprehensible with difficulty. Heavily influenced by mother tongue. Many sounds mispronounced.
2-3	<i>Adequate</i>	A number of errors, with particular problems with more difficult sounds. Otherwise intonation and pronunciation mostly acceptable.
4	<i>Good</i>	Pronunciation and intonation mostly correct, although there may be occasional mispronunciation with more difficult sounds.
5	<i>Very Good</i>	Only occasional errors of pronunciation and intonation. Sounds authentic most of the time.

Grid 4D: Quality of language**10 marks**

There is a mark out of 5 for grammatical accuracy and another mark out of 5 for range, variety and appropriateness.

Grammatical accuracy

0-1	<i>Very poor</i>	Little evidence of grammatical awareness. Persistent serious and elementary errors in endings, tenses, genders.
2	<i>Poor</i>	Evidence of gaps in basic grammar. Frequent errors of an elementary kind, e.g. irregular verbs frequently not known; adjectival agreements and common genders faulty.
3	<i>Adequate</i>	Shows evidence of fair understanding of grammatical usage but performance is likely to be patchy and inconsistent. Attempts more complex language, but work is characterised by being inconsistent and with variable accuracy. Expression rather forced and problems with correct word order.
4	<i>Good</i>	Accuracy generally consistent. Shows sound grasp of A2 structures list. Tenses and agreements sound although there may be some inconsistency and errors in more complex areas.
5	<i>Very good</i>	High and consistent level of accuracy. Mainly minor errors. Confident and correct use of the full range of structures contained within the specification.

Range, variety and appropriateness

0-1	<i>Very poor</i>	Very limited vocabulary. Frequent anglicisms. Very limited range of structures. Only simplest sentence patterns.
2	<i>Poor</i>	Narrow range of vocabulary. Frequent repetition of common words. Some attempt at more complex sentence patterns, but errors still, even in common structures.
3	<i>Adequate</i>	Some attempt to extend range of vocabulary but still rather repetitive. Shows some ability to produce syntax and structures appropriate to the task.
4	<i>Good</i>	Good range of vocabulary with little repetition. A positive attempt to introduce variety. Ambitious in use of a variety of complex sentence patterns but not always able to maintain correct usage.
5	<i>Very good</i>	Apt use of a wide range of vocabulary. Able to use idiom appropriately. Confident use of a wide range of complex sentence patterns and structures.

Grid 4E: Factual knowledge, ideas and opinions**10 marks**

Note that it is not possible to be specific in the following grid because of the diversity of topics presented. The examiner should adapt the general statements below to the specific topics being addressed by the candidate. Grid 4E focuses on (i) knowledge and factual information; (ii) evidence of reading and preparation; (iii) ideas and opinions. Note that response to the examiner is assessed as AO1 in Grid 4C. The concern here is with knowledge and opinions.

0-2	<i>Very Poor</i>	Conveys very little information about the topics. Material very thin and vague. Much waffle or superficiality. Gives the appearance of not having studied the subject seriously. Insubstantial and hesitant delivery. No, or very few, ideas or opinions expressed.
3-4	<i>Poor</i>	Little information beyond the obvious or commonplace. Material thin, rambling, repetitious. Some evidence of preparation, but delivery is pedestrian, as are the one or two ideas expressed.
5-6	<i>Adequate</i>	Solid base of information with evidence of preparation. Material is factually sound, but with no evidence of wider reading. Material may not always be relevant. Exposition of topics is serious but somewhat stilted. Has begun to think about the issues and express ideas.
7-8	<i>Good</i>	Detailed exposition of the topics. Well-informed with a range of relevant factual information. Well-prepared material. Interesting ideas and observations.
9-10	<i>Very Good</i>	Shows well-informed and consistently well-illustrated factual knowledge of the subject. Knowledge is allied to a clear grasp of the subject and understanding of the context and wider issues, and is expressed in a range of opinions and observations. Detailed preparation evident and topic presented with style and flair.

Note: In cases where candidates fail to offer some factual knowledge, ideas and opinions related to the country where the language is spoken, a maximum of 4 marks (**Poor**) will be available on Grid 4E.

**Mark Scheme 2655
June 2005**

Please use the following symbols on all scripts to indicate marks awarded and any deductions.

- 1 Tick each relevant point for which a whole mark is awarded.
 - 2 Draw a single line under any language errors [in parts of the examination where language is to be marked].
 - 3 Indicate omitted information by a caret sign ^.
 - 4 Indicate superfluous information by a wavy line.
 - 5 Where candidates give alternative answers, only the first one written, or the one on the line should be marked.
 - 6 Where an addition distorts / invalidates the response, indicate this by 'd'.
 - 7 For each question or section, write the mark awarded in the right-hand* margin. At the end of the exercise write the total marks, **and ring this figure**.
- Left-handed markers may use the left-hand margin.
- 8 At the end of Sections A and B, write the mark awarded for Quality of language as 5A or 5B and ring this mark.
 - 9 In the extended writing exercise in Section C, show the mark for Grammatical Accuracy (G) and then the mark for Range, variety and appropriateness (R).

For the Range mark in cases where answers are irrelevant or there are gaps:

- 10 or more of the relevant points covered + a personal response – assess on full range of 5 marks
- 5 to 9 of the relevant points covered + a personal response – assess on maximum of 3 marks
- fewer than 5 of the relevant points covered + a personal response – assess on maximum of 2 marks
- If no attempt at a personal response then deduct 1 mark from total awarded for this grid
- If the answer is totally irrelevant then award 0 marks

- 10 Transfer the totals for each task to the front cover; insert the Quality of language mark after the appropriate question. On the OMR marksheet enter **the final total only**.

Réponses à la tâche 1 :

Accepted answers	Rejected answers	marks
<p>a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • dynamiser Internet (1) • (et instaurer / assurer / donner / offrir)<u>plus de</u> confiance(insist on plus de) / also accept as one alternative the title: sécuriser le commerce électronique (1) <p>accept for 2 marks : instaurer plus de confiance en dynamisant Internet we want 2 ideas : making Internet dynamic + give more confidence</p>	<p>confiance rendre Internet moins dangereux</p>	2
<p>b)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • indiquer (clairement) leur identité / leurs identités (plural form is penalised in the language mark) • et leurs coordonnées • la règle du double click (or the explanation of the rule) <p>Any two points out of the above 3 for 2 marks</p>	<p>Prouver coordonner</p>	2
<p>c)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interdiction d'utiliser l'adresse d'un internaute (1) <p>accept : on ne peut pas / on a pas le droit / il ne faut pas / interdiction d'envoyer du matériel / du spam...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sans lui avoir demandé (son avis préalable) (1) <p>accept : sans sa permission</p>		2
<p>d)</p> <p>(Le renforcement de) <u>la responsabilité</u> des hébergeurs et fournisseurs d'accès à Internet. (1)</p> <p>In order to gain one mark it is essential to have [la responsabilité] + des hébergeurs et fournisseurs d'accès à Internet / des hébergeurs/ fournisseurs d'accès à Internet.</p>		1
<p>e)</p> <p>La surveillance / surveiller (1)</p> <p>also accept as an alternative : agir vite en cas de délit / faire cesser un délit /arrêter l'accès de sites pédophiles / réduire l'accès pour les pédophiles</p>	<p>Plus de sécurité t.c. protéger</p>	1
<p>f)</p> <p>(i) Elle menace / arrête la liberté d'expression (sur Internet) (1)</p> <p>(ii) Elle ne protège pas (assez) (les droits d'auteur) / elle est insuffisante(1)</p>	<p>Elle a un effet sur la liberté (too vague)</p>	2

Réponses à la tâche 2 :

Accepted answers	Rejected answers	marks
<p>a) <u>la consommation</u> d'énergies fossiles / <u>la consommation</u> de pétrole / pétrol (spelling error will be penalised in the language mark), charbon, gaz (1) If the alternative answer is used at least 2 elements out of 3 must be mentioned.</p>	<p>Les énergies fossiles t.c. Réchauffement climatique</p>	1
<p>b) (i) substitution / substituer du gaz <u>au</u> pétrole / (et surtout <u>au</u> charbon) (1) (ii) parce que c'est une ressource inégalement répartie (1)</p>	<p>use of [ou] for [au] as it changes the meaning Il y a des pays avec beaucoup de charbon t.c.</p>	2
<p>c)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>capturer</u> le gaz carbonique <u>en sortie</u> des (grandes) usines(1) both elements needed for one mark. accept [vient des] for the idea of comes out ; accept : (grandes) centrales. • et <u>le</u> stocker (1) must give an indication of what is stored <p>Accept the first two answers only, so if the first answer is wrong e.g.[L'énergie nucléaire et renouvelable] followed by the two correct answers, the candidate will be awarded one mark only.</p>	<p>L'énergie nucléaire et renouvelable (= text not understood as it says that they pose long term problems in cost and acceptability.)</p>	2
<p>d)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • l'énergie nucléaire est utilisée (1) • dans la production d'électricité (1) <p>[la France a des centrales nucléaires] is two marks as [centrales] is a place where electricity is made. Du fait que les centrales nucléaires maîtrisent le gaz carbonique dans la production d'électricité (2)</p>	<p>Stations nucléaires</p>	2
<p>e) c'est le secteur dont / dans lequel / où les émissions <u>croissent</u> (1) accept: [l'émission] / leurs émissions <u>croissent</u></p>	<p>Use of [dans] instead of [dont] Les émissions croissent t.c.</p>	1
<p>f) cela dépend de <u>comment</u> l'électricité est fabriquée(1) [comment] is essential</p>	<p>Il dépend sur la production de l'électricité [Commun] for [comment] ...dépendent de la fabrication d'électricité <u>elles</u> dépendent</p>	1
<p>g) Elle émet moins de gaz carbonique / la réduction des émissions de gaz carbonique / une réduction de 40% à 50% des émissions de gaz carbonique (allow wrong percentage e.g 45%). (1)</p>		1

In addition 5 marks to be awarded for AO3 Grid 5A (see following)

Remember to write 5A language mark after task 2 and record it on the front page in the box next to the mark to task 2.

The mark scheme awards communication, for showing that the candidate has understood what he/she has heard.

Hence if the answer is comprehensible to a French speaker and conveys the required message marks can be allocated. Beware of the use of English words, which would be comprehensible to an examiner but would not be comprehensible to a French person with no knowledge of English. The candidate will be penalised for inappropriate use of language in the 5A mark.

However if the language impairs the communication to the extent that it makes the message incomprehensible or changes the meaning then no marks can be awarded.

Put a tick for points you are awarding marks, and put a cross next to the wrong answers, in the body of the text. Underline all the language errors. Circle consequential errors. Put a circle over letters where accent is missing or wrong. Put an L above good language points. Put your marks in the right-hand margin, circle the total and transfer it to the front cover. If a question is wrong or not answered put 0 in the margin: do not leave it unmarked.

Grid 5A

0-1 Very Poor

Little evidence of grammatical awareness. Persistent serious and elementary errors in spelling, agreements and transcriptions from the spoken word.

2 Poor

Evidence of gaps in basic grammar. Frequent errors of an elementary kind, in spelling, agreements and transcriptions from the spoken word.

3 Adequate

Shows evidence of fair understanding of grammatical usage but performance is likely to be patchy and inconsistent. Still recurrent errors in spelling, agreements and transcriptions from the spoken word.

4 Good

Accuracy generally quite consistent, but quite a number of minor errors in spelling and agreements and one or two more serious lapses in transcriptions from the spoken word.

5 Very Good

High and consistent levels of accuracy. Only minor errors and slips in spelling and agreements and virtually no problems in transcriptions from the spoken word.

Réponses à la tâche 3 :

Accepted answers	Rejected answers	marks
1) réduit / diminue / minimise / baisse / peut réduire	évite fait moins	1
2) un avantage / mieux / bénéfique / avantageux also un bénéfice/meilleur (for communication only, not for language)	Made up words / anglicisms: beneficial / beneficielle / bénéficioux	1
3) est né accept : était né (but penalise in language) if candidate added [en début d'année ou en fin], consider it to be superfluous information		1
4) tous	obligatoirement	1
5) (l') on réfléchisse / nous réfléchissions / nous nous concentrons / plus d'attention soit portée also accept : réfléchir (but penalise in language)	<u>Le gouvernement</u> réfléchisse considérer	1

Réponses à la tâche 4 : copying errors will not be allowed in this exercise

Accepted answers	Rejected answers	marks
a) pédiatre		1
b) adaptée à	adaptée adapté à	1
c) peu propice	défavorables (in the text but in the plural and we want a singular word) / défavorable (not in text) peu propice à	1
d) sont en avance de langage	en avance de langage <u>ceux qui</u> sont en avance de langage	1
e) trouveront d'avantage de stimulation	d'avantage de stimulation trouveront d'avantage de stimulation <u>et de chaleur</u>	1

Réponses à la tâche 5 :

Accepted answers	Rejected answers	marks
<p>a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> commencer l'école / enseignement / éducation / aller à l'école(1) à un très jeune âge / plus tôt que d'habitude / très jeune / avant l'âge normal/à deux ans/à trois ans/avant l'âge de quatre ans (1) <p>We want an explanation of the word [scolarisation] (the idea of going to school/starting school/getting an education) and the word [précoce].</p>	<p>Avant l'âge de 5 ans / 6 ans / l'école maternelle Plus tôt, très tôt, trop tôt t.c. (as it has another meaning, it would mean early in the morning). Introduire à l'école Une école pour les enfants qui ont moins de 6 ans/une école</p>	2
<p>b)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> milieux / classe sociale / situation (1) défavorisés / où il y a des problèmes d'argent / pauvres / qui n'ont pas beaucoup d'argent / désavantagés (1) <p>Ideally we are looking for an explanation of the phrase [conditions sociales] (social background) and [défavorables] (deprived) but we will also accept for 2 marks a global explanation of [conditions sociales défavorables] e.g. la misère.</p>	<p>Moyen de vivre / atmosphère / mode de vie / façon de vivre Mauvais / qui n'est pas idéal / dérisoire / qui n'est pas acceptable Reject specific examples illustrating rather than explaining the phrase</p>	2
<p>c)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> accepter / recevoir / accueillir (ces jeunes enfants) (1) est une tâche difficile / coûteuse (pour les écoles) / qui pose des problèmes / qui impose beaucoup de travail supplémentaire (1) 		2
<p>d)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> possibilités / possibilité / probabilité / les opportunités (1) d'obtenir de bons résultats / d'être reçu aux examens/de bien faire à l'école / d'avoir du succès / de réussite(1) 	<p>Il est plus probable de.../ il aura plus de .../ opportunities Succéder / Success</p>	2
<p>e)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> l'enfant n'est pas habitué / accept a negative expression which conveys the same idea (il n'aime pas / ne veut pas / ne sais pas...)/ l'enfant trouve difficile (1) à avoir de la compagnie / à vivre en société / à avoir des relations humaines faciles) / de parler avec les autres / comment parler avec les autres / comment faire des amis (we are looking for an explanation of socialising (1) <p>le gamin ne s'intègre pas avec les autres = 2 l'enfant n'a pas d'amis = 1</p>	<p>à socialiser l'enfant n'a pas <u>beaucoup</u> d'amis</p>	2

In addition 5 marks to be awarded for AO3 Grid 5B (see following)

Remember to write 5B language mark after task 5 and record it on the front page in the box next to the mark to task 5.

As in the listening tasks, the marks are awarded for communication, for showing that the candidate has understood what he / she has read. Put a tick for points you are awarding marks, and put a cross next to the wrong answers, in the body of the text. Write the mark in the right-hand margin. Underline all the language errors. Circle consequential errors. Put a circle over letters where accent is missing or wrong. Put an L above good language points. Add up all the marks in the right-hand margin, circle the total and transfer it to the front cover. If a question is wrong or not answered put 0 in the margin: do not leave it unmarked.

Grid 5B: Reading Comprehension**5 marks****0-1 Very Poor**

Little evidence of grammatical awareness. Persistent serious and elementary errors in endings, tenses, genders. Only simplest sentence patterns, and those mainly incorrect.

2 Poor

Evidence of gaps in basic grammar. Frequent errors of an elementary kind, e.g. irregular verbs frequently not known; adjectival agreements and common genders faulty. Some attempt at use of subordinate clauses and more complex sentence patterns, but errors still even in common structures.

3 Adequate

Shows evidence of fair understanding of grammatical usage but performance is likely to be patchy and inconsistent. Attempts more complex language and shows some ability to produce syntax and structures appropriate to the task but work is characterised by being inconsistent and with variable accuracy. Expression rather forced and problems with correct word order.

4 Good

Accuracy generally consistent. Shows sound grasp of A2 structures list. Tenses and agreements sound although there may be some inconsistency and errors in more complex areas. Ambitious in use of a variety of complex sentence patterns but not always able to maintain correct usage.

5 Very Good

High and consistent level of accuracy. Mainly minor errors. The overall impression is one of competence. Confident and correct use of a varied range of structures.

Réponses à la tâche 6 :

Accepted answers	Rejected answers	marks
<p>a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • workshops (1) / play rooms • where children play <u>freely</u> (1) • individual beds (1) • where the child can <u>leave</u> his soft toy / teddy / stuffed toy <p>accept toy / toys on its own because the idea targeted here is the one of leaving behind (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • motivated (1) • and determined teachers (1) 	<p>Buildings / structures / places / a study / playground / area / play area for [ateliers] Decisive / dedicated for [déterminé] Read individually for [lit individuel] Liberally for [librement] Leave their stuff/things</p>	6
<p>b)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reasonable number of pupils in the class (1) • member of staff / staff / a carer / people who is / are patient (1) • very lenient / very tolerant / permissive / accommodating / can easily forgive (1) • thoughtful / kind / attentive / give attention(1) 	<p>Class is reasonable (there is no reference to size) Staff pay attention / attentionate Permissible / permissif On the ball</p>	4
<p>c)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to socialise (1) • to discover / learn <u>new</u> things(1) • to play (1) • to develop language (1) • to develop autonomy/independence/make them less dependent (on their parents) (1) • to make <u>big / great / better</u> progress / children improve <u>greatly</u> (1) <p>Accept nouns e.g. it gives great opportunities for socialisation, discoveries, games / fun (= 3 marks)</p>	<p>socialism Learn things</p> <p>Develop individuality / personality / self / themselves / autonomousness / mobility / personal control / self sufficiency / self awareness</p>	6
<p>d)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they can't ask to go to the toilet (1) 		1
<p>e)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they feel abandoned (1). If candidates have added [traumatised], consider it as superfluous information. • because it is their first time away from their mother / parent / parents (1) 	<p>Feel traumatised t.c.</p>	2
<p>f)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they attend morning classes only / to go to school only in the morning (1) 		1

Réponses à la tâche 7 : (marked according to grid 5C)

In order to have access to the full range of marks in the Range criteria the candidate must have covered a minimum of 10 points (each point is numbered in the body of the text) plus one personal response, which is 10 points plus at least one opinion. If fewer than 10 points have been covered, the maximum mark for Range will be 3/5.

Below 5 points, the maximum mark for Range would be 2/5. Deduct one mark from the total if there is no personal response.

Accepted answers	Rejected answers	
a) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ils seront choqués par la nouvelle loi • qui condamnera jusqu'à six mois de prison • et à une amende de 7 500€ • tout élève qui porte outrage à professeur /insulte un professeur. 		
b) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • le délit était déjà puni (par une petite amende), • mais la loi était rarement appliquée. • Beaucoup de personnes sont horrifiées • Mais le gouvernement insiste qu'elle est nécessaire • pour combattre la délinquance juvénile croissante • et rétablir l'ordre dans certaines écoles • pour lutter contre le crime, la violence, l'insécurité quotidienne. 	Jamais appliquée	
c) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L'automne prochain pour la première fois depuis 1950, • les jeunes délinquants récidivistes • pourront être emprisonnés dans des centres de détention pour jeunes • dès l'âge de 13 ans • au lieu de 16 ans. • Les parents des jeunes délinquants pourront aussi perdre leurs allocations familiales. 		
d) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beaucoup pensent que ces mesures vont trop loin. • Les hommes de loi sont sceptiques • et ne voient pas comment ces mesures pourraient marcher et être utiles. • La Ligue pour les droits de l'homme critique ces mesures • et pense qu'elles puniront des familles qui sont déjà marginalisées • et vivent une existence précaire. 		
e) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ceux qui souffriront le plus sont les familles d'immigrants • qui vivent dans les cités délabrées des banlieues. 		
f) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ils trouvent que c'est assez choquant • et contre productif • et que le fossé entre profs et élèves s'agrandira • et l'attitude des jeunes délinquants se durcira. 		

Grid 5C: Quality of language 10 marks

There is a mark out of 5 for grammatical accuracy and another mark out of 5 for range, variety and appropriateness.

Grammatical accuracy**0-1 Very Poor**

Little evidence of grammatical awareness. Persistent serious and elementary errors in endings, tenses, genders.

2 Poor

Evidence of gaps in basic grammar. Frequent errors of an elementary kind, e.g. irregular verbs frequently not known; adjectival agreements and common genders faulty.

3 Adequate

Shows evidence of fair understanding of grammatical usage but performance is likely to be patchy and inconsistent. Attempts more complex language, but work is characterised by being inconsistent and with variable accuracy. Expression rather forced and problems with correct word order.

4 Good

Accuracy generally consistent. Shows sound grasp of A2 structures list. Tenses and agreements sound although there may be some inconsistency and errors in more complex areas.

5 Very Good

High and consistent level of accuracy. Mainly minor errors. Confident and correct use of the full range of structures contained within the specification. Only minor errors of spelling which do not affect the morphology.

Range, variety and appropriateness**0-1 Very Poor**

Very limited vocabulary. Frequent anglicisms. Very limited range of structures. Only simplest sentence patterns.

2 Poor

Narrow range of vocabulary. Frequent repetition of common words. Some attempt at more complex sentence patterns, but errors still even in common structures.

3 Adequate

Some attempt to extend range of vocabulary but still rather repetitive. Shows some ability to produce syntax and structures appropriate to the task.

4 Good

Good range of vocabulary with little repetition. A positive attempt to introduce variety. Ambitious in use of a variety of complex sentence patterns but not always able to maintain correct usage.

5 Very Good

Apt use of a wide range of vocabulary. Able to use idiom appropriately. Confident use of a wide range of complex sentence patterns and structures.

**Mark Scheme 2656
June 2005**

Unit 2656 (French)**Culture and Society (written paper)****Total: 60 marks****MARKING SCHEME**

Information about and understanding of topics,
texts and issues 40 marks for each essay
(AO4) [Grid 6A]

Quality of Language 20 marks for each essay
(AO3)[Grid 6B]

The following general principles apply to the marking of the Culture and Society paper in all languages.

1 **Assessment criteria:** All scripts are to be marked in accordance with the assessment criteria below (Grids 6A and 6B).

2 **Marking:** Examiners are asked:

- (a) to single-underline all language errors
- (b) to indicate omissions by a caret sign ^
- (c) to indicate superfluous or unclear material by a wavy line.

3 **Comments:** Examiners are asked to write **no comments** at all on the scripts. However, in certain cases it may be helpful to attach comments on a separate sheet when an explanation of the allocation of marks may be deemed necessary.

4 **Length:** There is no limit on the number of words to be written per essay; no penalties, therefore, are to be imposed.

Essays which are too short should be assessed as normal; the shortness will usually be self-penalising.

5 **Rubric infringements:**

Where candidates write their essays based on the same text or topic, only the better of the two should be marked.

In such cases the action taken by the examiner must be clearly shown at the foot of the essay, and the words **RUBRIC INFRINGEMENT** written on the front cover. There is no need to mark such scripts for the attention of the Team Leader.

Any other cases of rubric infringements should be drawn to the attention of the Team Leader.

- 6 **Reference to the country:** Both the Aims and the Assessment Objectives of the Specification indicate that essays in Section C must relate to "a country where the language studied is spoken". It is acknowledged that some of the topic titles have international application, but each title in the specification specifically refers to the country / countries in question. There is, therefore, no excuse for essays which do not refer to the country / countries studied. It should be noted in this respect that, with the exception of those topic areas asterisked in the specification, **any** country where the language is spoken is acceptable for the purposes of this paper (eg Francophone Africa; Austria; Latin America).

Essays which make no or little reference to the country / countries in question may be awarded no more than 7 marks on both grids.

- 7 **Indication of marks:** At the end of each essay, the examiner must show the mark awarded under each separate grid, and the resulting total, which should be ringed.

e.g.

6A	15	17	32
6B	6	7	13
			45

Add the two totals out of 60 together to get an overall mark out of 120. Divide this by two (rounding up any ½ marks) to get a final total out of 60. Indicate this on the front cover of the answer script.

e.g.

$$45 + 38 = 83 = \textcircled{42}$$

Grid 6A (1) Information about topics, texts, relevance and appropriateness of response

40 marks

0-3 Very Poor

Extremely brief and/or very inadequate answer. Little or no knowledge of the text/topic. Frequent irrelevance. A very superficial treatment of the task.

4-7 Poor

The candidate has a limited grasp of the text/topic. Some material but little attempt to organise it or answer the question. There are omissions and some irrelevancy in completing the task.

8-11 Adequate

Evidence that the candidate has understood the text/topic presented. The essay has a preponderance of content but there is evidence of ability to recognise the central issues. Rather dull treatment of the task.

12-15 Good

Evidence of thought and preparation showing a sound knowledge of the text/topic, supported by factual knowledge. Mainly relevant to the task and demonstrating some imagination and/or originality (where appropriate).

16-18 Very Good

The text/topic is used and pointed to the question, the general issues pertinent to the text/topic have been taken into account in response to the question. There is evidence of an ability to produce an imaginative and/or original response to the task (where appropriate).

19-20 Excellent

Intelligent use of factual information, clarity, sense of control. Clear evidence of thoughtful evaluation of texts/topics. A precise and thorough response to the task showing insight into the text/topic.

Grid 6A (2) Understanding of topics, texts and issues, structure and development of ideas.

20 marks

0-3 Very Poor

May have great difficulty communicating at this level in the foreign language. Ideas presented at random. Sequence illogical with no development of an argument and no ability to draw conclusions.

4-7 Poor

Little attempt to structure the work. Some sequence in facts presented, but a weakness in paragraphing and no real build-up of an argument to a conclusion. Rambling and disjointed.

8-11 Adequate

Ideas generally organise in a structured way and some ability to organise into paragraphs and sequence the argument, although somewhat superficial.

12-15 Good

Some ability to develop ideas and opinions even if without much sophistication. Clear line of thought with competent development of argument. Ideas mostly well-linked and some ability to draw conclusions.

16-18 Very Good

The essay has an argument and develops a case but there may be some limitations in scope. There is a clear line of thought and/or evidence of an ability to draw conclusions.

19-20 Excellent

Well-balanced and coherent piece with an excellent introduction and good organisation with clarity and a sense of control. Ideas clearly linked and well-developed. Thoughtful work.

Grid 6B Quality of language **10 marks****Grammatical accuracy** **10 marks****1-2 Very Poor**

Little evidence of grammatical awareness. Persistent serious and elementary errors in endings, tenses, genders.

3-4 Poor

Evidence of gaps in basic grammar. Frequent errors of an elementary kind, e.g. irregular verbs frequently not known; adjectival agreements and common genders faulty.

5-6 Adequate

Shows evidence of fair understanding of grammatical usage but performance is likely to be patchy and inconsistent. Attempts more complex language but work is characterised by being inconsistent and with variable accuracy. Expression rather forced and problems with correct word order.

7-8 Good

Accuracy generally consistent. Shows sound grasp of A2 structures list. Tenses and agreements sound although there may be some inconsistency and errors in more complex areas.

9-10 Very Good

High and quite consistent level of accuracy. Confident and correct use of the full range of structures contained within the specification. Only minor errors of spelling which do not affect the morphology.

Range, variety and appropriateness **10 marks****1-2 Very Poor**

Very limited vocabulary. Frequent anglicisms. Very limited range of structures. Only simplest sentence patterns.

3-4 Poor

Narrow range of vocabulary. Frequent repetition of common words. Some attempt at more complex sentence patterns, but errors still even in common structures.

5-6 Adequate

Some attempt to extend range of vocabulary, but still rather repetitive. Shows some ability to produce syntax and structures appropriate to the task.

7-8 Good

Good range of vocabulary, with little repetition. A positive attempt to introduce variety. Ambitious in use of a variety of complex sentence patterns, but not always able to maintain correct usage.

9-10 Very Good

Apt use of a wide range of vocabulary. Able to use idiom appropriately. Confident use of a wide range of complex sentence patterns and structures.

**Report on the Units
June 2005**

REPORT ON AS FRENCH ORAL, SUMMER 2005

Introduction

There were many good performances in the Summer 2005 examinations, where candidates displayed an impressive range of vocabulary and structure and sound preparation of the role-plays and topics. The strongest candidates were able to use their initiative and imagination in the role-plays in conveying information clearly and at length. They were able to develop arguments effectively in the extension questions.

Candidates who were less successful tended either to omit some of the main points or to have difficulty in expressing themselves clearly. As in previous years, the quality of language varied considerably. The strongest candidates displayed the ability to handle quite complex language accurately. Weaker candidates made a number of elementary errors, which in some cases impeded comprehension.

There were some interesting topics, where candidates gave evidence of research on individual subjects. These in many cases led to informative and interesting discussions, in which the candidates were able to take charge of the conversation. Candidates choosing topics such as food and drink, smoking, alcoholism, or football in France tended to be not as well informed as those choosing more individual subjects. The discussions were frequently rather superficial.

Role-plays

Response to Written Text

Task A

This was the task most frequently used as it came first in the random sequence. It was generally well handled by candidates, many of whom were able to convey the necessary information without difficulty. Some candidates had problems with the name Felixstowe, and there were several versions, including Flexistowe, Flexito and Felixstone. Many candidates were able to explain that the history of Felixstowe went back to Roman times, although some of them did not succeed in making the points clearly. The word siècle was unknown to some candidates, who consequently had difficulty in explaining the growth in tourism. Some candidates said that the town was 100 years old, some did not refer to the growth in tourism. The accommodation available was generally well handled, and many candidates, who did not know the term chambres d'hôte were able to describe bed-and-breakfast accommodation reasonably clearly. Many candidates did not explain that the pier dated from the beginning of the 20th century, and therefore its age was not clear. However, those who used some imagination and said that it was 100 years old, were successful.

The extension questions were handled in different ways. The most successful candidates were able to develop the task into a short discussion about the popularity of seaside resorts and the problems which sometimes occur. Some candidates, however, related the extension questions only to Felixstowe, rather than attempting a general discussion, which was the intention of the questions. Some candidates did not sufficiently develop answers to the second question and did not go far beyond the prompts given on the candidate's sheet.

Task B

This role-play was mostly well done by the candidates who attempted it. It was encouraging that candidates usually knew the vocabulary required. Very few candidates failed to mention clearly the animals available at the garden centre. Most of them conveyed the point about the number of plants, but did not mention the guarantee unless prompted by the examiner. Exhibition still causes problems for some candidates, although this word has been tested several times in the role-plays. It was pleasing to note this year that few candidates were unfamiliar with gratuit and did not attempt to use libre to describe the free car park. There were some very good responses, including: il y a des vendeurs qui donnent un soutien gratuit; Vous savez, mon petit dada est le jardinage, mais ne le dites à personne. The candidate, who said, Moi, j'ai souvent besoin d'un perroquet proved at least that there can be some humour, even in examinations!

Task C

There were some good performances on this role-play, but some candidates had difficulty in explaining some of the main points fully and clearly. Most candidates conveyed the idea of the story of football from 150 years ago to the present day. Many of them mentioned the interactive exhibition, but did not refer to the individuals and teams. The memorabilia in the museum and the video and audio highlights of games were not always clearly expressed. The filmed table-football and the commentary on *Match of the Day* were referred to by many candidates, although some had problems in expressing the fact that the commentary was recorded. There were some very good explanations of the reference to Preston North End, some including the appropriate date, but some candidates did not succeed in explaining this point fully. The directions, opening times and admission charges were mostly well conveyed.

Task D

This task was used less frequently than the others, as it came last in the random sequence and therefore occurred only in larger centres. It was mostly well done by candidates, who were in most cases able to convey clearly the languages available on the translator, the number of words in each language and the total number of words in the memory. Some candidates added the 120 expressions contained in the translator. The subjects included also caused little difficulty. The various functions of the machine were generally covered, although there were some omissions. Memos and watch with alarm caused the most difficulty. Most candidates referred to the dimensions and the price. As in the other role-plays, numbers still cause problems for some candidates, and there continues to be confusion between quatre, quatorze, quarante, quatre-vingt cinq and quatre-vingt quinze. Quarante-vingt-quinze was by no means infrequent. Dimensions still cause problems for some candidates and the use of par for sur is frequent. Many candidates needed prompting to explain that the calculator would fit into a pocket.

Task E

This task was successfully completed by many candidates, who were able to explain clearly the information about the commentary, the booking of tickets, the sights and the river cruise and also the traditional fish-and-chips. Very few candidates mentioned the panoramic view from seven bridges, and many found difficulty in explaining how to book theatre tickets. Office instead of bureau or guichet was often heard.

Task F

This task was completed successfully by many candidates. Almost all candidates made some attempt to explain the fact that the stations are restored to reflect different periods of history and to give details of a station. There were some instances of station being used for gare and of gare being pronounced as querre. Some candidates could, however, have conveyed the information more clearly. The information about *Thomas the Tank Engine* was generally clearly conveyed and most candidates were able to state the location of the steam railway, the telephone number and the opening days. Some candidates continue to give telephone numbers in single figures rather than in the French way of groups of two digits. Some candidates did not explain that the restaurant was on the train while some of them had difficulty in reading the timetable with departure and arrival times. In general, however, this task was well done.

Response to Examiner

The two preliminary questions were handled slightly better than in previous examinations, and it was encouraging to hear candidates attempting to introduce them with phrases such as Je voudrais savoir or Pourriez-vous me dire? Some candidates did not attempt to vary the forms on the candidate's sheet. For example in Task A, the question Quel est le type de séjour apprécié? would be better rendered by, for example, Quel type de séjour préféreriez-vous? Some candidates still fail to change the possessive adjective to suit the question, for example in Task B, question 2 and in the two questions in Task D.

Many candidates responded well to the examiner's questions, and were able to give extensive answers to the requests for information. It was encouraging to hear candidates taking the initiative and giving some information without having to be asked for it. However, the role-play is expected to be a dialogue, and the right balance needs to be struck between examiner and candidate. Some candidates failed to introduce the task clearly after the preliminary questions, even when there was a prompt from the examiner. For example, in Task A, some candidates did not mention the town of Felixstowe before giving information about it.

The extension questions were well handled by many candidates, who were able to speak at length and give convincing replies to the two questions. Some candidates did not develop the extension questions very far. For example, in Task A, they mentioned that in some seaside resorts there were problems of hooliganism and alcohol, but did not extend any further. Some candidates did not answer the extension questions in a general way, but related their replies to the text. For

example, in Task A, the question of why seaside resorts are popular was answered with reference to Felixstowe and some of the information in the text was repeated. The question, which included les stations balnéaires, was intended to be answered with reference to seaside resorts in general.

Language

As in previous examinations, the quality of language varied considerably. The strongest candidates were able to speak at length with few errors. Candidates, who were less successful in this area, made a number of errors, some serious, for example:

j'ai trouve
vous trouve
le 20 siècle
j'ai resté
le train départ
promenader
aux les
je pense c'est
pour exemple
est 5km en long
ils amis

il offert
vous pense
l'hôtels
quel type de séjour intéressez-vous?
de le, de les
jouer le golf
je vous proposez
beaucoup des
place for endroit
à le, à les

Incorrect genders occurred in words such as ville, région, siècle, gare, famille, port, plage, cuisine, guerre, locomotive, fin, plupart, voiture, saison, semaine, langue, voiture, garantie, culture.

In most cases candidates displayed a good knowledge of vocabulary, and there were few problems, in spite of the occasional anglicism, for example: cruise, journée for voyage, station for gare, part for partie, libre for gratuit (although this was much less frequent than previously), sports d'eau, place for endroit, century.

Examining

In most cases the role-plays were correctly timed and kept to the five minutes allowed. The recordings were mostly clear, although there were some examples of faulty tape recorders where there was background noise. It is very important to place the microphone in a position where the candidate's voice is clear. In a few cases the examiner's voice could be heard more clearly than that of the candidate. It is advisable to test the equipment prior to the examinations.

Most examiners conducted the examination well and made correct use of the suggestions in the examiner's booklet. There were some instances however, where examiners did not give the candidates sufficient opportunity to cover the key points. It is important to ensure that the questions in bold are covered, either by the candidate spontaneously or by asking the necessary questions. The other questions are intended to help the candidate to complete the key points. However, sufficient time must be allowed to enable the candidate to answer the extension questions without going over time.

Examiners should ensure that they do not ask for information which has already been supplied by the candidate, and should also be careful not to give information,

which the candidate is expected to provide. Marks cannot be awarded for information “fed” by the examiner. For example, in Task D to elicit the first key point, the word poche should be avoided and the questions put in a form like Est-ce que le traducteur est facile à porter?

It is important that examiners prepare the role-plays carefully in advance to avoid hesitation in asking questions, as this can be disconcerting to the candidates. It can also waste time and cause the role-play to overrun.

2. Topic Discussions

Presentation

There was a wide variety of topics chosen by candidates. At the top of the range it was a pleasure to listen to candidates discussing intelligently and enthusiastically topics of genuinely personal interest. Particularly noteworthy was a candidate talking about Descartes. There was evidence of real interest and considerable research with detailed knowledge and understanding, leading to a fascinating discussion, in which he was able to react appropriately to the examiner’s questions and extend his ideas and opinions impressively. Other excellent performances included discussions of films and film producers, painting, festivals in France and regions, such as Quebec, where a candidate had personal experience of the area and was able to make comments on the position of the French language; of Maupassant, which contained an analysis of the main themes of the *contes*; and Franco-German relations, where the candidate showed a sound understanding of events on both sides since 1871.

Candidates who chose a personality such as Thierry Henri, Eric Cantona, Claude Monet, Toulouse-Lautrec or Marie-Curie rarely got behind the essential contribution of these celebrities and many of them did not build sufficiently on the facts to develop ideas and opinions. For candidates who choose a region of France or a French-speaking country, it is highly advisable to have some personal experience in order to extend beyond basic and obvious facts.

Candidates offering topics such as smoking, alcohol, food and drink or football in France tended to have rather thin content and did not on the whole convey more than superficial and obvious material. In many cases the material was not supported by concrete facts and examples.

Statistics and percentages can be useful as illustrations to support information, but many candidates need advice on how to use them effectively. Many candidates should also be encouraged to give greater thought as to how they might add style and flair to their presentations to offset the banal statements of facts and figures. A challenging question or exclamation at the beginning would create a better tone than the simple Je vais parler de.

Some candidates waste time by saying what they are going to talk about rather than filling the presentation with facts and trying to present them in an interesting way.

In this examination there were fewer over-rehearsed or recited presentations, although they did occur. Although it is accepted that candidates need to learn the facts in order to be able to present them clearly and coherently, spontaneity is necessary if the subject is to be presented with style and flair. On the same theme,

the presentation is intended to last for two to three minutes. Candidates should therefore avoid giving a series of memorised mini-presentations during the discussion, as this tends to prevent the development of ideas and does not make the best use of the factual information.

Spontaneity and Fluency

Many candidates spoke confidently and fluently and were able to develop convincing and extended arguments, built on a solid factual base. The most successful performances were those where the candidate took charge of the conversation. They reacted well to the examiner's questions and were able to convey their ideas and opinions in an interesting way, supporting their arguments with further factual information.

Candidates who were less successful in this area became less fluent when asked to go beyond material which they had rehearsed. Some of them did not offer many ideas and the discussions were mainly factual and superficial in content. Some discussions sounded as if a button were being pressed to provoke a prepared response. However, there were fewer such instances this summer and the overall standard of performance was a little higher than in previous examinations.

Pronunciation and Intonation

As in previous examinations, candidates' intonation varied considerably, although there were many examples of candidates who sounded French most of the time. There were some instances of incorrect pronunciation, for example the im- and in- prefixes, which still cause difficulty, in words such as influence, intéressant, installations, important, impossible. Other errors included:

The aine ending in words such as semaine, entraîne (pronounced semain, entraïn)
Th pronounced as in English in catholique, méthode
Gn incorrectly pronounced in words such as signifier

There was also a tendency to sound silent endings, for example in et, ils, dans, nord, aspect, respect, cas, état, temps. Sounding of the third person plural –ent in verbs such as app+récient, aiment, parlent, vivent suggests that the candidates making this error may have been reading from notes.

Conseil, bouteille, alcool, gouvernement, pays and femme still cause problems for some candidates.

Anglicised pronunciation was also evident in words ending in -asion and -ation for example in occasion, administration and also in parents, comparer, syndicat, principal, symbole, danger (er pronounced as in hiver).

Nasal sounds were also sometimes incorrect, for example in jardin, fin, roman, an.

Some of the errors of pronunciation may occur when candidates are relying too heavily on notes and are therefore reading from a script.

Language

As in the role-play, there was a range of performance on quality of language. Many candidates attempted to use complex structures such as passives, subjunctives, *après avoir/être, depuis, dont* and *en* + present participle. It was pleasing to hear a variety of tenses, with the conditional perfect by no means infrequent.

The vocabulary of the majority of candidates was adequate to the task and in some cases very good. There were some anglicisms, for example, success, actuellement, traditional, formal, physical, professional, individual, personnellement, salaries, reason, réalistique, billions.

Accuracy also varied, and there were a number of errors, for example:

de trouve
ça encourager
après on a fini
à le, à les
ils apprend
ils ont contents
au Paris
qui participer
il changer
à 1907
vous voit
dans le télévision
il y a violente
ils vourent
vous besoin

beaucoup des
en 5 juin
de le, de les
j'ai expérience
per cent
la femme parler
les jeunes est
ils boire
ils a peut
à Belgique
peuvent provoque
j'ai voir
on a catholique
les hommes, les femmes est

Incorrect genders occurred in words such as raison, personne, roman, région, musique, plupart, style, consommation, tradition, lutte, banlieue, matière, qualité, fois, guerre, famille.

Examining

Many Teacher/Examiners conducted the examinations well and were able to create a sympathetic and encouraging atmosphere. In most cases the timing of this part was correct and candidates were invited to supply a good range of factual information and to develop their ideas and opinions at length.

In some centres candidates were not asked sufficiently searching questions, either to encourage them to give detailed facts or to express ideas. Many of these discussions remained on a superficial level and in some cases did not extend far beyond what would be expected at GCSE. Some candidates sound as if they are relying too heavily on notes and some of them appear to be reading not only the presentation but also the answers to the questions in the discussion. This seriously disadvantages candidates. It is important that the discussion is spontaneous and that candidates are given the opportunity to express their ideas, opinions and personal reactions at length. Questions should be designed to help them to attempt complex language (for example by encouraging a variety of tenses) and to enable them to extend their factual information thereby building on this to express their

ideas. Ideally, they should choose subject, which will give them the opportunity to give evidence of research and to discuss at length.

Conclusion

In spite of the problems mentioned in this report, there were some excellent performances, which revealed initiative and imagination both in the role-play and in the topic discussion. It was most encouraging to hear very fluent candidates who had an impressive command of French and an enthusiasm for their topics.

2652: Listening, Reading and Writing 1

General Comments

This unit discriminated very well and produced a very wide range of performances – from outstanding to very poor. An improvement was noted in two areas in Section 2 “The World of Work”: Task 4 (Listening) and Task 6 (Writing). Centres have been successful in developing candidates’ awareness of the requirements of these tasks which are now answered much more satisfactorily than in previous sessions. To improve performance on the Listening tasks further, candidates would be very well advised to read rubrics and questions carefully and then to listen to the short recorded passages in full to have a gist understanding of them before trying to answer individual questions. Performance on Task 3 (Reading) in Section 1 was disappointing, possibly because some may not have been familiar with the subject matter of the passage (advertising techniques) but more probably because the test-type associated with the text (gap-fill exercise) is one that candidates find difficult to master. Regular practice in all test types is strongly recommended.

Comments on Individual Questions

Task 1: Listening

- 1) This was designed to be an easy question, accessible to most candidates, yet many either did not read the question sufficiently carefully or did not listen to the full sentence before answering it. They erroneously gave C as their answer.
- 2) A very common incorrect answer was B. The lack of ability to distinguish between nasal sounds (*son / sans*) may account for a number of mistakes in answering this question. Additionally, weaker candidates latched on *sort* in the text and *sortir* in B.
- 3) There was no clear pattern here, although common sense should have led candidates to exclude A from the possible options.
- 4) Candidates who listened to the full sentence had no difficulty in identifying B as the correct answer. Those who did not, chose A when they heard “*la longueur totale d’un parcours*”.
- 5) Only the better candidates associated *actrice* and *rôle* with *son travail* (C). Many thought – incorrectly - that A seemed a likely reason.
- 6) This was a demanding question designed to identify the best candidates, able to understand the idiomatic expression “*ne pas en croire ses oreilles*” although many should have been able to make the link between *croit* and *incroyable*.
- 7) A fairly well-answered question, although weaker candidates heard *guichet* in the passage and chose A. The negative should have given them the clue that this was not the correct answer.
- 8) A well answered question with two clues (*écrit / écrite* and *en tout petit / en petites lettres*) pointing candidates towards the correct answer: B
- 9) Most candidates showed that they had understood the general sense of the

passage in selecting A. Those who had not were drawn to the apparently logical answer that C seemed to provide.

- 10) It was pleasing to see that few selected the obvious distractor A and although all may not have understood *amende*, the use of *payée* in the passage led them to choosing C correctly.

Task 2: Listening

This slightly more demanding exercise was a good discriminator and the marks gained by candidates were a fair indicator of their ability overall. The technique recommended for Task 1 also applies here. Unfortunately, as in Task 1, some candidates penalised themselves by not answering every question. With non-verbal tasks, it is better to have a guess than to leave a blank which is a certain wrong answer. Candidates should use (highlighter) pens to underline key words; if necessary they may write the odd key words in English if they feel it helps them, but translating the various statements in full is a poor use of time. Use can be made of the blank page opposite to jot down phrases transcribed from the tape.

- 2) Only the weakest candidates had difficulties with this question which required a gist understanding of the first paragraph of the text.
- 3) As school was not mentioned anywhere in the passage, this question was also very accessible.
- 4) This required a detailed understanding of *une femme sur deux* and the ability to identify that it was not the same as *presque toutes ...*. Most candidates could work this out.
- 5) Surprisingly, this was poorly answered although there were two ways of getting the correct answer: understanding of two adverbs: *aussi* in the text, implying there that there was more than one cause and *seulement* implying that there was only one would have done it. Gist understanding of the first paragraph should also have led candidates to the same conclusion i.e. that the statement was incorrect.
- 6) This question was aimed at the better candidates familiar with the implications of the idiomatic expressions *des bons petits plats*. Many made the link between *bonne cuisine* and *bons plats*.
- 7) The passage made no reference to the amount of food eaten by the French, but the phrase *petits plats* may explain why the weaker candidates thought that the statement was true.
- 8) This question, requiring inference of meaning, was aimed at the best candidates. It discriminated well at this level.
- 9) Again, there was no reference in the text to amounts of food eaten, but poorer candidates latched onto the mention of *en famille* in both text and statement and incorrectly answered that the statement was true. A number of candidates did not tick any box. All should check that the number of ticks they write matches the number of marks available for the whole task.
- 10) Understanding of numbers and of the comparative was all that was required here. It was disappointing that all could not manage to get the right answer.

- 11) The weaker candidates may have responded to a common stereotype when ticking the *Vrai* box. However, most understood that, according to the text, cooking was now counted as a leisure activity, on a par with gardening or jogging, for both men and women, without reference to any preference for either group.

Task 3: Reading

Many candidates did this exercise poorly. Its theme – advertising techniques – is one of the AS topic areas. It is suspected that a number of candidates thought they could answer this question without reading the text and tried to fill the gaps from the summary only. It may be that candidates who did not understand the title – and more specifically the word *sons* - felt that there was no point in reading the text. There was evidence to show that some used grammatical clues before making a choice. This practice can confirm the choice of a word or narrow down possibilities, but it is not a substitute for reading and understanding the text. Many answered totally randomly; clearly they decided they were not prepared to spend any time on this exercise.

The best way to tackle such an exercise is to read the text in full for gist understanding, then to pause and reflect on the message of the passage. Understanding of the main reading text should guide the candidate in choosing the right words to complete the gaps in the summary.

The first question was quite accessible and in fact a good number of candidates successfully related the three specific sounds mentioned at the start of the text and the phrase *entourés de millions de sons* to the adjective *divers*. Similarly many understood H and E were the answers to Q3 and Q4 but assigned them the wrong way round. At this level, candidates should know the difference between *écouter* and *entendre*; in practice those who knew were the minority. The better candidates associated *rassurer*, *enchanter*, *émouvoir* with *sensations*; the others just guessed. Q6 was more successful, although those who gave the correct answer (A) were far fewer than anticipated: linking *faire ouvrir notre porte-monnaie* and *faire des achats* proved too testing for many. Equating *études poussées* and *une recherche intensive* seemed beyond all but the more able, as was Q8. A common incorrect answer was B (*attire*), showing that candidates had failed to realise that the verb required in the gapped text referred to the product and not to the potential customer. Q9 was difficult, partly because *tissu* was not known. This is also true of *outils*, the answer to Q11. Finally, Q10 was one of the best answered questions in this exercise.

Lack of vocabulary is partly responsible for the poor performance in this task; so the nature of the test is perceived as particularly difficult by some.

Task 4: Listening – The World of Work

It was pleasing to see that candidates were more willing to tackle this exercise than in previous sessions, so there was less need to scale down the language mark because questions had not been attempted. It seems that most candidates had understood the passage and were able to write something sensible. The quality of language was also significantly better than in previous years, in spite of careless errors. All the same, candidates would be well advised to take time to

check that basic grammatical rules have been applied and that the French they have written does make sense.

- 1) This question was generally correctly answered, even by the weakest.
- 2) The same is true of this question although some mistook *deux* and the first syllable of *douzaine*.
- 3) Candidates scored at least one mark, often two. The most frequent errors were *banque* and *garage*. In spite of the bold [2] in the question and the clear 2 for mark allocation, a significant number of candidates put only one tick, thus wasting the potential to gain one more mark overall.
- 4) Most had understood the text well enough to score at least one mark (*journal régional* - or more frequently *journal régionale*) and many had understood *vétérinaire* even though they could not spell it correctly.
- 5) (a) Although often incorrectly spelled, *allonger* was less of a stumbling block than *les séjours*, occasionally rendered as *ces jours* or *seize jours*. Some candidates did not score the mark because they failed to render the idea of possibility.

(b) The relevant section of the text was usually understood and it helped that there were three possible answers for two marks only. However, attempts to transcribe everything they had heard resulted in a number of problems, especially with the latter part of the sentence (*ce n'est qu'après qu'on commence à tirer des bénéfiques de l'expérience*). As in Task 1, the inability to distinguish between "on" and "an" sound was evident and *qu'on* was thought to be *quand*. Another common error was the use of *attirer* instead of *à tirer*, showing that candidates were trying to transcribe something which they had not understood. The word *travail* was frequently spelled *travaille*.
- 6) (a) Most candidates failed to understand "*m'ont offert deux postes*" and their attempts to transcribe this phrase showed it: *monte(ent) (à) faire des/des post(e)(s)* was very common and could not be given any credit. Only the better candidates identified the past participle of the verb *offrir*.

(b) Attempts to transcribe "*postes à risques*" often resulted in *postes risques* which was, of course, allowed because it would be understood. As in the case of most questions, few candidates attempted to use their own words. Attempts to transcribe "*Faut-il que les stagiaires soient assurés ?*" usually contained several errors, but a good proportion managed to score the point. Strangely enough, many candidates did not think of amending their incorrect spelling of *stagiaires* when they came across the word in the next question.
- 7) Sentence-completion questions are designed to test comprehension as well as the ability to manipulate language. Too many kept the verb in the 3rd person singular, as in the text, unless they omitted the verb altogether. Most inserted the negative. The better candidates used *payés*, which they could spell, rather than *rémunérés* as in the passage.
- 8) The first part of this question was answered quite well because the majority of candidates knew the word *lycée*. Many failed to apply basic adjectival

agreement rules to both *quelle* and *officielle* although they had clearly written *la position*. A pleasing number of candidates knew the word *primes* possibly from having met it on numerous occasions when practicing the Speaking unit role-plays. Of those who did not, many opted for *déprimes* / *déprimés*. As in Q6 many did not identify the pronoun and mistook *leur donne* for *l'ordonne*. The last statement produce some odd renderings, which should have been rejected, had candidates taken time to think about what they had written (*certaines entreprises veulent des déprimés* / *veulent donner des crimes*). In a few cases *vouloir* and *voler* were mixed up, which gave rise to very unlikely reasons.

Task 5: Reading

This task differentiated very well and produced a full range of marks. As in earlier sessions, some candidates attempted to give a word-for-word rendering of the French text, which resulted in gibberish. Other candidates tried to build a plausible version, based on some key words they had understood / misunderstood. They may not have gained any more marks than the previously mentioned candidates, but at least what they wrote made sense and was rendered in grammatically correct English. However, generally, grammar, spelling and punctuation were better than in previous sessions. Words such as 'necessary', 'appropriate', 'success' were spelled more accurately than in the past, even if many still cannot cope with 'itineraries'. The other frequent spelling errors related to 'valuable', 'preparation', 'competence' and 'responsible'.

1st paragraph

Many found this difficult. Had they read the rubric in English, they would have known how to render *randonnées à vélo*. Many candidates, unfortunately, had not come across the expression *le train-train de la vie* and tried very hard to bring trains into their translation. At this level *enseignants* should have been known, but many thought it was the same as *renseignements* or equated it to the English "assignments". In the second sentence, the comparative (*plus attrayant que*) was often rendered by a superlative. Although it has appeared several times in previous tasks, the idiomatic expression *bien entendu* is not generally known. At the end of this paragraph *à fond* also led to mistakes, with many thinking it related to funding rather than to depth. There were some excellent renderings of the text where candidates moved away from it and used their own words to convey the right ideas (e.g. ...*which allows you to exercise, relax and learn for qui permet d'associer sport, loisirs et education*)

2nd paragraph

This paragraph represented about half the marks allocated to this translation exercise and candidates understood it very much better than the first paragraph. In many cases one or more of the following expressions was not well translated: *Au fil des années* (some mistook *fil* for *fil* or *fille*), *nous avons mis au point* (thought to mean 'to make a point of'), *une série de fiches techniques* (ignoring the word *fiches*), *l'entretien des vélos* (occasionally translated as "interviewing bicycles"), *l'équipement de protection* (inverted and given as "the protection of equipment") and *les règles de circulation* (often rendered as "the rules of circulation / of the circuit").

3rd paragraph

This paragraph was quite well understood and most candidates managed to score two out of the three marks available for this section. *Quelle que soit*, recognised by the more able candidates, was simply omitted by the others; so was *réussite*. This should have been known or understood because of the obvious similarity with *réussir*. The final sentence was the most difficult: candidates mistook the object pronoun in *Nous aimerions vous signaler* and made *vous* the subject of the verb (“we would like you to tell us”). Furthermore, they did not seem to know *stages de formations* although *stages (de travail)* appeared in Task 4 and *formation* should be part of the minimum vocabulary taught to prepare candidates for the World of Work section of this paper.

Task 6: Writing

This task was more successfully completed than similar exercises in previous years. Many candidates had been well trained in the use of formulae which, when judiciously used, lend a certain authenticity to letters of this nature. Most of them seemed to realise that it is not a word-for-word translation of the message that is required but a transfer of the ideas it contains into appropriate French. Relevant items of vocabulary, which appear in either of the other parts of Section 2, may be used. However, candidates must be warned that it is unwise to use phrases that they have not understood, as they may not convey the required idea: « *nous sommes intéressés par votre train-train* » would leave the reader of the letter very puzzled indeed. When grid 2C is applied, incorrect or inappropriate vocabulary is regarded as incorrect structure.

The first bullet point was accessible to most. It seems that nearly all candidates think that *été* is a feminine noun (*l'été prochaine*). It was good to see that many candidates had gone beyond the mere translation of the English statement, in an attempt to produce a genuine letter.

In the second part of the message, a few did not know how to express ‘grateful’, so chose a word with a similar beginning *gratuit* or *grace*. ‘We are interested in’ should not have presented any difficulty, yet *nous nous intéressons à* or *nous sommes intéressés par* did not figure as frequently as “*nous sommes très intéressons dans*”. Apart from the inability to produce the correct form of the possessive adjective *vos* noted in previous years, candidates coped quite well with the rest of the second bullet point.

Asking questions is still beyond the grasp of far too many candidates at this level, although there has been a vast improvement over recent years. Some candidates do not know the difference between *est-ce que* and *qu'est-ce que*. Many resort to simply adding a question mark at the end of a statement, hardly appropriate in the context of a “Work” letter. Inversion of subject and verb is not properly mastered.

The third bullet point was difficult to express but many showed much imagination in changing and adapting the phrase to make it fit with language they knew. For example *On doit avoir combien de professeurs pour combien d'élèves ?* conveyed the message. *Il faut combien de professeur pour chaque élève ?*

conjured a picture of particularly unruly pupils and was not uncommon. *Est-ce qu'il y a une loi qui dit combien d'adultes on doit avoir pour combien d'enfants ?* was another good attempt. *Quel est le taux d'encadrement requis par la loi en France ?* also found in some scripts, shows an awareness of language, beyond what is normally expected at this level. The use of *devoir* – or similar – implied that candidates had attempted to render “required by law”. There is much confusion over the construction of *il faut*, *il est nécessaire* and *avoir besoin* (where *besoin* is treated as an invariable verb).

The fourth point revealed that a verb as common as ‘to hire’ was not generally known. Some tried to get round it (*emprunter des vélos*, *acheter pour quelques jours seulement* or similar), others made *loyer* into a verb or produced a mangled form of *louer*. Finally, others used the wrong word and gave the wrong message (*Est-il possible de lancer des vélos?* or *Est-il possible de voler des vélos?*)

The meaning of the last bullet point was seldom successfully transferred because candidates did not know ‘to supply’ and found it hard to express the question (*Doivent les élèves supplier*). Candidates do not seem to know the rules about inversion of verb and subject in interrogatives.

Although Examiners reported a marked improvement in tackling the last exercise of the paper, they also mentioned a widespread carelessness in the application of basic grammatical rules or their application. Candidates must take greater care over concordance between subject and verb and between noun and adjective, use and formation of tenses, phrasing of simple questions; they must make this a priority if further improvement is to be achieved.

2653 French Reading and Writing May 2005

Principal Examiner's report

General Comments

The paper elicited a wide range of marks. There were a few scores of 60/60, but at the lower end, a number of candidates struggled to understand and to make themselves understood.

Rubric infringement was a problem in Questions 1 and 2; candidates should remember to check that they have completed the correct number of answers in the non-verbal exercises. The first two always add up to 15 marks, although the precise number within each exercise may vary from session to session. Question 4 is always worth 15 marks.

Time allocation is not usually a problem with this paper; in fact some clearly think they have time to spare. It would be appreciated if centres could advise their candidates that they should not deface their scripts with art work, mathematical formulae, lists of words (sometimes scurrilous: these have to be reported and could in extreme conditions lead to disqualification) or indeed compliments on the beauty and intelligence of the examiner. Handwriting is becoming increasingly difficult to read.

Comments on individual questions

Question 1

Most candidates did well in this question, although a number appeared to be unsure of the meaning of *tôt* (a); ticks for Au Limonaire and L'Attirail indicated that they thought it meant 'late' rather than 'early'. Some lost marks by ticking too many boxes, in a few cases as many as twelve instead of the eight required.

Question 2

Answers to this question were more variable. Most candidates were able to deal well with nos. 5 – 7, but the first four caused some difficulty. There is still a tendency to choose the sentence which looks most like the words of the passage; 1 C was often chosen because of the similarity of *citer* and *célèbres* in question and text. For 2, the meaning of *grande surface* was often not known: many thought it referred to a market instead of a hypermarket. Misunderstanding of the negative *ne...que* may have been the reason why the wrong answer was given for 4.

A few candidates left no.1 blank.

Question 3

In Question 3 the personal response (paragraph (c), grid 3C) was well done, and the quality of language (grid 3A) in many cases was very competent. The main problem in this question continues to be the conveying of precise information to show comprehension of the text (paragraphs (a) and (b), grid 3B).

Report on the Units Taken in June 2005

Grid 3A - Quality of Language

There were some excellent answers, showing familiarity with grammar, structure and idiom. It must be emphasised, however, that examiners are instructed to reward the achievement of all candidates who show knowledge of a range of AS structures, and not to reserve the top bands only for those who write with near-native fluency.

Use of the dependent infinitive has increased, and there was a good range of expressions requiring the subjunctive. As has been noted previously, however, there is a tendency not to link *bien que* properly with the rest of the sentence. There were fewer examples of pre-learnt phrases being used inappropriately, although the occasional *autant que je sache* was found followed by statements such as '*il y a des restaurants en ville*', which suggested a degree of naïvety.

There were many basic errors. Incorrect verb endings, often for the wrong person, were frequently found: *ils allons, il veux, vous regarde*. The conditional of *préférer* was almost always written as *je préférais*; if candidates find this difficult they might perhaps be advised to use *aimer mieux* instead. It was a common mistake to use *donc que* or *alors que* for 'so that' (in the sense of a purpose clause). Agreement of adjectives was sometimes poor; spelling was weak, notably of *ennuyeux* but more generally of words which were in the text (*voiture, construire, accès, avantages*). The use of *l'escaliers* for the plural form was widespread.

Confusion of vocabulary was rife. In many cases this meant that a point for comprehension could not be awarded as the meaning was changed (see below).

Candidates should be reminded that if they copy whole phrases from the text or from question 4 these are discounted when assessing language.

Grid 3B – Comprehension of the text

The best marks for question 3 were usually obtained by those who were able to extract relevant information from the text in answer to the questions in paragraphs (a) and (b). This was the area in which many good candidates lost marks, often because they explained one or two concepts only, in great detail. They should be reminded that there are 10 marks to be gained for showing comprehension, and they would do well to identify 10 points in the text – there are usually between 16 and 18 possible points - before they start to write their answer. The rubric now shows both questions at the beginning, so there is no excuse for writing the answer to (a) in (b) and vice versa.

Candidates should avoid repeating the whole of the question at the beginning of their answer (it counts as 'lifting' and wastes words and space) and including irrelevant material (*l'architecte, qui s'appelle François Seigneur*).

In (a) there was some confusion as to where the vehicle was to be parked; many thought there would be one car park per storey. Most identified the architect's intention to include an office and a games room in each flat. Many missed *sans* in the second paragraph of the text and thought he would abolish pedestrian lifts and stairs. Incorrect vocabulary here included the confusion of *monter/montre, gare/garage*, and *voiture/car (il construira des halls d'entrée assez grands pour recevoir les cars)*.

Report on the Units Taken in June 2005

In (b) the word *immeubles* in the question was misunderstood by many candidates; a few read it as *meubles*, but many thought it meant 'disabled', perhaps because they saw the verb *paralyser* in the text. This led to statements such as *l'immeubles peuvent faire du shopping plus facilement*. In this paragraph points could often not be awarded because important details were omitted; it was not the shopping itself that would be made easier, but the unloading of it on returning to the flat. Similarly the project itself would not transport the children, but would make it easier for parents to do so. Misuse of vocabulary in this section included the anglicisms *location* and *facilités*, *faire les cours* instead of *faire les courses*, and a surprising confusion of *voisins* with *valises* (*vos valises ne deviendront pas ennuyées avec vous*).

Common sense is an important factor in any comprehension exercise, so the candidates who wrote *Ils voudraient construire un bâtiment grand pour les voitures de 35m, la voiture peut faire des courses pour remplir le frigo, il a l'intention de construire un 5e étage à côté de la cuisine, and il va supprimer les escaliers et utiliser les piétons* should have realised that there was something wrong when they checked what they had written.

Grid 3C – Response

Many candidates wrote an excellent response to the final section of this question. There were a number of fairly banal points made (there is lots to do in town, there are animals (*muttons*) in the country, the town is noisy, the countryside is green. Many were able to develop these points further and thus gain extra marks (the town is the best place for young people but when I'm older I might enjoy the peace of the country, animals are often not allowed in flats and dogs need a garden). A pleasing number of candidates showed evidence of the insight and imagination required for the top mark bands, and there were many interesting points made such as *s'il y a une panne d'électricité comment est-ce qu'on pourrait utiliser la voiture qui reste dans l'ascenseur?* and *ce projet encourage les gens à être paresseux*.

Again there was some incorrect use of vocabulary, particularly *son* for *bruit*, *salé* and *salle* for *sale*, *aire* for *air*, *magazines* for *magasins* and *compagne* for *campagne*.

It is perfectly possible to gain full marks, and indeed many candidates did so, by keeping to the space given on the paper. The suggestion of 200 words for the whole exercise is a recommendation, not an imposed limit, and some candidates wrote at considerably greater length. This was usually not to their advantage: first, because they were likely to make more language errors and thus reduce their 3A mark; secondly, because if they did not make their meaning clear their overall mark for 3C was reduced proportionately.

Question 4

The multiple choice grammar question was well done. A number of candidates gained full marks, and scores of 13 and 14 were frequently found. Centres are to be congratulated on their success in preparing candidates for this question; their standard has improved steadily since the introduction of the specification.

The questions which caused difficulty included

- (a) many chose *cette* (*appartement*). It might be helpful if centres could find time to cover some gender rules, but it was felt that the gender of such a

Report on the Units Taken in June 2005

common noun (and one which would certainly be learnt within the topic of Living Conditions) should be known anyway.

- (d) Some candidates still think that *tout le monde* is followed by a plural verb.
- (j) A favourite choice here was *se battent*, yet in their written French most were able to use the dependent infinitive with confidence.
- (k) all three possibilities had their supporters here. The singular verb should have eliminated C.
- (l) A popular choice was A, but the penultimate line of the text clearly showed *idée* to be feminine.

OCR FRENCH SUBJECT REPORT SUMMER 2005

SPEAKING AND READING (2654)

General Comments

As far as the articles (Discussion of Text) were concerned, the majority of candidates found the themes familiar and seized the opportunity to develop their ideas on social and religious problems, juvenile delinquency, immigration, inequalities for women in the workplace and issues facing young people. Very few candidates this year failed to grasp the bare bones of their text – essential if we are to test speaking as well as reading. The ability to grasp the essential points, to paraphrase successfully and expansively develop ideas, marked out very clearly the better candidates from those who depended too much on reading directly from the passage. Weaker candidates showed, too, a high degree of dependence on the Examiner's questions.

In some cases, candidates performed only as well as they were allowed to by the Examiner: it is still common for some Examiners to harry and pester for an answer, even to push for the precise answer they are expecting or have decided upon, lacking the patience to await the candidate's utterance, and even interrupting the candidate who has omitted what, in their view, is a crucial detail. Yet others either repeat questions automatically, without waiting for any response, or fragment and simplify questions to a point where they cease to be a test of comprehension.

Whilst being conscious that generalisations are unlikely to help individual Centres to improve, a number of experienced markers this summer reported concern about various aspects of candidate performance on the topics (General Conversation).

Topics were often carefully chosen and well researched, with many conscientious and capable candidates learning an impressive volume of material, as well as demonstrating an ability to manipulate it; in an increasing proportion of interviews, however, this prepared material lacked spontaneity. Markers reported a worrying number of candidates who had learned everything by heart, so that the discrepancy in performance between Discussion and General Conversation became even greater. Also, in a significant number of cases, candidates did not appear to have the grammatical knowledge to express their ideas convincingly. Somewhat surprisingly, a marked deterioration in aspects of pronunciation was reported. Is it the pressure to recite large amounts of material that causes candidates to neglect pronunciation and intonation? Certainly, the latter nearly always suffers whenever candidates "rattle off" pre-learned chunks. Finally, some bilinguals gave a disappointingly casual performance with regard to factual knowledge, appearing to have done little or no research, relying wholly upon unsubstantiated snippets of information.

Articles

Unlike in some previous years, there was no noticeable preference for certain texts over others: all found more or less equal favour with centres and Visiting Oral Examiners.

Text A (Student accommodation shortages)

Good candidates pulled a great deal out of this text. They were able to give detailed accounts of the views expressed by the three students interviewed, and the fact that those views clearly impinged upon the reality of their own situation as would-be university students made for some lively conversations. Weaker candidates tended to pick out isolated points from the views expressed with linguistic constraints impeding the clear expression not only of personal viewpoints but also of the number of students in the Ile de France and the number of rooms available for them. Some thought that Stéphane was a girl. For some reason, most candidates failed to hear / understand the words *à part* in Q5 and kept on talking about *logement*. Sensitive Examiners began referring to *autres problèmes* but even this did not help some candidates who ploughed on with the accommodation theme. Relatively few candidates mentioned the idea of payment in advance. Unless specifically asked, candidates tended to omit the significance of greater safety in central Paris as opposed to the suburbs being a major factor in the demand for accommodation there. Many of our 18-year-olds appear to believe that the State should simply pay for everything!

Text B (Muslim experiences in France)

This proved to be a successful stimulus text, although weaker candidates tended to struggle with the more abstract concepts, especially the notion of *un bon comportement moral*. The best candidates not only described the viewpoints of the three young people interviewed but also analysed them in terms of their own religious and non-religious experiences. Many candidates took the opportunity afforded to move the conversation towards the wider issues raised by such events as the terrorist attacks of the 11th September and by the attitude of the French government towards religious identity as well as by multiculturalism generally. It was surprising to hear a number of candidates who, having said that they had no religious beliefs, expressed positive views about the role of religion in society.

In a small number of cases, this text was given to candidates whose chosen topic for the general conversation was *La laïcité* or something similar, such as racism or immigration. Centres are reminded that though there is no prescribed rotation of texts, it is important to exercise discretion in selecting the passage given to a candidate; there must be no overlap of subject matter between the passage chosen and the topics listed on the candidate's General Conversation form.

Text C (Curfew initiatives)

Candidates and Examiners seemed to enjoy discussing this text. Many candidates had very clear views about which of the two schemes they preferred and why, and they made interesting connections between the problems referred to and the situation in their own area. Weaker candidates frequently got the wrong end of the stick, however, believing that the curfew was intended to protect *les moins de 13 ans*; few picked up on *non accompagnés*. Many also experienced difficulty in their endeavours to explain *une logique de ghettoïsation* which some of the better candidates were able to contextualise by referring to the situation in

Nazi Germany. The view that it is better to approach these problems positively like the mayor of La Rochelle was almost universal but, paradoxically, many candidates also seemed to think the rather extreme curfew type of idea was totally justified. Few were able to explain the final paragraph concerning parental involvement, especially the idea of *responsabilisation*, whilst the contrast of *banlieue* and *grande ville* produced similar results to those in Text A.

Despite the shaky grammar, we rather enjoyed this answer from a girl who said that her parents would not allow her out alone at night at 18, let alone 13: *Si les membres de SOS-racisme considéraient leur propre enfant, ils sauraient faire toute leur possible pour assurer que leur enfant n'était pas dans lieux dangereux* (sic).

Text D (Young people's views on a number of current issues)

The skilful exploitation of this passage by a number of Examiners demonstrated very clearly that it is often better not simply to work through the possible questions provided on the Examiner's sheet but rather to move forward naturally, basing the questioning on the last thing that the candidate has said. Conversation based on this text developed in a whole variety of ways depending on the issue in which the candidate expressed most interest. Many candidates struggled when attempting to find synonyms for *demandeurs d'emploi*, *des gens bien*, *unanimes* and when trying to deal with the question involving *on les prend pour des imbéciles*. The possible re-introduction of *la peine de mort* was a subject about which quite a few had very clear ideas, as was *l'immigration clandestine* and ways to tackle the problem. Drugs, both the British and the French political scenes and society's relatively new acceptance of alternative sexualities also found their takers, and the result was often a very lively discussion. Interestingly, few singled out unemployment as their main concern – in sharp contrast to their French counterparts. Perhaps that will have changed by the time they are 29! Some weaker candidates had trouble with the last sentence, thinking that marriage was very unpopular, but most agreed with the statement about the importance of the family.

Text E (Continuing inequalities for women in the workplace)

This text was well exploited by candidates of both sexes. Some female candidates took an overtly feminist stance while others were more resigned to the situation; boys often expressed a certain surprise sometimes tinged with embarrassment that such inequalities persist in the twenty-first century. As in the case of the other texts, there was a tendency on the part of some candidates, perhaps encouraged by the relatively large number of statistics given, simply to read from the passage rather than describe and evaluate the situation in their own words. It goes without saying that candidates who persistently read aloud the text in front of them cannot hope to gain access to high marks for Grid 4A (Understanding of and response to the article). The good Examiner will of course intervene and ask such candidates to explain what they understand by some of the less obvious words and phrases that have been 'borrowed'; this indeed happened, with explanations being judiciously requested in the case of items like *le taux d'activité*, *des cadres*, *des femmes mères de famille* and *retraite partielle*. The second sample question on this text (*Comment les droits acquis par les femmes après 1945 ont-ils fourni plus de possibilités de travail?*) was deemed a little problematic, because the text itself did not contain the answer in concrete terms; it required a degree of inference not needed elsewhere and would perhaps have been better used as a 'general' question in the second half. Certainly, few were able to explain the link between the laws concerning abortion and contraception and the opening up of the working world to women; indeed, one (very good) candidate bravely challenged the Examiner, saying

that she did not understand the point of the question! The advice remains: if you don't like the questions, don't use them, but please be sure to replace them with something equally demanding and of comparable linguistic complexity. It does not do the candidates any favours if the Examiner steadfastly avoids words (especially the 'key' words) which he / she thinks the candidate may not know – just as there is little value in pummelling the candidate until every last detail of the text has been extracted.

Text F (Eating disorders)

This rather sensitive text generated some very good conversations. Some candidates described and analysed the problems encountered by friends or acquaintances who had been the victims of one of the two eating disorders in question while others were particularly interested in the cause of such disorders and the degree to which society is responsible. Few focused on the information about family problems and appealing for help. Hardly any candidates picked up the feminine ending on '*adolescentes*' in Q3, sometimes despite a heavy emphasis on it by the Examiner. The addition of the word *esthétisme* to Q2 caused problems for some candidates, although most found plenty to say about the *image* idea. Many candidates floundered when asked to elaborate on *une relation saine avec la nourriture* and the notion of *responsabiliser* caused as many problems here as it did in Text C. The best Examiners followed the lead of the candidates but, as in the case of all of the articles, some seemed to feel constrained to work painstakingly through the list of possible questions provided on the Examiner's sheet, which made for some rather disjointed question and answer sessions rather than conversations: some candidates clearly found this rather disconcerting because when they were firmly embarked on a fruitful and interesting line of discussion, the focus was suddenly changed.

13 General Conversation

Good candidates chose a topic firmly rooted in the target-language culture and which they had clearly taken a lot of trouble to research in order to arm themselves with sufficient detail to sustain a probing and spontaneous 12 minute discussion. Moreover, they had clearly given a lot of thought to the information that they had discovered and had no difficulty in offering the views and opinions that good Examiners always sought.

The most popular topics were the ubiquitous *La laïcité*, *Le racisme*, *L'environnement* and *L'énergie nucléaire*, so it was refreshing when candidates offered relevant but less common subjects like *La décentralisation*, *Le rap* or *La sécurité routière*. Other examples of topics that yielded lively and interesting discussions were France and the European Constitution, the French bid to host the 2012 Olympics, the French political scene, industrial unrest in France, relations between France and the United States, anti-semitism in France and violence in French schools. One of the more arcane choices, stray dogs in Mauritius, ended up being rather too superficial. Elsewhere, one of the more apocalyptic 'facts' reported by a boy whose research had focused upon the environment was that "le niveau des océans a levé par un mètre pendant la semaine dernière".

Yet again, a few cases were reported where the Examiner was simply going through a series of pre-rehearsed questions to which the candidate replied with answers that had been learned by rote and which were totally lacking in spontaneity. Markers are well trained to spot such cases and cannot, of course, award high marks for Grid 4C (Spontaneity, comprehension, responsiveness, fluency).

It has to be said, too, that, despite the oft repeated *mises en garde* given at training meetings and in previous subject reports, a certain proportion of candidates persisted in choosing topics that were not firmly rooted in the target-language culture and which could not therefore access high marks for factual knowledge, ideas and opinions (Grid 4E). Centres are reminded that if candidates do insist on discussing such topics as the environment, pollution, euthanasia and the dangers of the internet, they must ensure that they are armed with detailed information about how that issue manifests itself in the target-language country. A further cause for concern is that of Examiners who, when faced with a candidate who has heeded this advice and who is armed with appropriate detail, constantly shift the focus back to Great Britain or to a general overview of the topic in question. In a number of cases listened to this year, the candidate's frustration at not being able to use the country-specific information that he / she had taken so much trouble to research, was only too evident.

It is pleasing that Centres appear increasingly aware that the topics chosen must be of current interest. A slight danger inherent in this stipulation is that candidates sometimes limit themselves to use of the present tense, whereas Grid 4D (Range of structures) seeks to reward those who can demonstrate "a wide range of complex sentence patterns and structures". Candidates should also be reminded that lengthy historical introductions – sometimes going back to 1789 or beyond – are inappropriate; such contextualising introductions should be curtailed. The main focus should be upon events, dates, references going back no further than the last seven years.

As far as the quality of language was concerned, some candidates were able to deploy an impressive range of vocabulary and advanced structures that they had no doubt encountered in the course of their research and had taken the trouble to make part of their active usage. At the other end of the spectrum, however, some candidates were unable to produce the sort of vocabulary and syntax necessary to sustain even a fairly basic conversation on their topic.

The most obviously deteriorating aspect of the speaking test was where (sometimes quite good) candidates pronounced final consonants with depressing consistency, especially the sounding of final *s* in such common words as *ils*, *elles*, *dans* and *les*. In one Centre every candidate made a liaison between *et* and a following vowel! Other recurrent errors of pronunciation included: *tion* pronounced as in the English word 'conversation', the anglicised pronunciation of the nasal sounds *in-* and *en-*, the failure to make a distinction between the sounds *u / ou* and the inability to differentiate between *jeunes* and *gens*, the latter producing some interesting sentences! Pronunciation of the endings of words like *danger / particulier* etc is now almost universally wrong. One can only speculate as to the causes of this deterioration. Might it have something to do with the almost total disappearance of reading aloud and the increasing emphasis on pupils doing private research on the internet etc. It would be fair to say that the identical (somewhat inadequate) descriptors for Pronunciation and Intonation (Grid 1F) produced more marks of 2/5 than 3/5 this summer.

The use of prepositions was often poor, resulting in unclear expression and ambiguity, eg *l'effet de (=sur) notre santé*. For some candidates *de* and *à* appear to be interchangeable.

Tenses generally seemed reasonably well handled, apart from the usual confusion between future and conditional. However, particularly notable was a failure to distinguish between *il y a eu / il y avait*; and between *a été / était*. It remains pleasing that even quite mediocre candidates manage to include a couple of correct subjunctives, sometimes in a quite spontaneous way.

Have we all given up teaching genders? Very few candidates now get even quite common genders right. It was astonishing to hear candidates (and lots of girls) referring to *les adolescentes* as *il a pu / ils ont pu* rather than *elles ont pu*. The latter pronoun seems to be disappearing from use but perhaps this is also true of France?

Other matters

Many Centres had clearly heeded points of an administrative and technical nature made in previous reports and there were far fewer hiccoughs in these very important areas. However, a problem that was again in evidence in a fortunately limited number of cases was that of Examiners who insist on giving their own views at excessive length, thereby seriously curtailing the time that the candidate has to demonstrate his or her own linguistic ability. In one case, an Examiner even saw fit to write a note to the marker to say how much he had enjoyed conducting such a mature conversation: the truth of the matter was that the Examiner had expounded his political views at some length, whilst the poor candidate had been able to do little more than make a few remarks expressive of her approval of the views to which she had had no choice but to listen!

Earlier reports have encouraged Examiners not to proceed through their questions like an express train; on the other hand, it is equally unhelpful to speak as though to a 3-year-old. Where Examiners speak very slowly and without expression, the response can be similarly bland and slow.

Candidates may of course support their topic discussion with one side of A4 notes. Occasionally, however, markers identify substantial amounts of reading of these notes and are thus unable to award high marks for spontaneity (Grid 4C) and intonation (Grid 1F). One candidate who adopted what one might describe as 'reading intonation' gave the game away not only by excessive paper rustling but also whenever she referred to *les mondations* instead of *les inondations* – clearly unable to read her own writing! Similarly, there will undoubtedly be penalties if candidates are heard simply reading the notes they have written while preparing the article.

On the positive side, fewer Centres exceeded the time limits by a significant amount, although quite a few spent too long on the article and did not achieve a proper balance between the Discussion of Text and the General Conversation. One candidate was however disadvantaged by being allowed to discuss his topic for only 7 minutes and 35 seconds.

Judging by what is submitted on the Oral Topic forms (OTF/2654), some Centres now ask candidates to list what they wish to discuss on these sheets and then just go through it in the manner of the AS exam.

There remains some irritation when Examiners relentlessly examine two topics in every case, sometimes switching to a second almost at the end of the 10 minutes (and in one case after 12) when it was not in any way necessary. Virtually no candidate needed or needs this.

Many Centres did not supply any mark sheets. This is contrary to administrative instructions and gravely impedes the work of the OCR examiners.

Report on the Units Taken in June 2005

One Centre saw fit to annotate the WMS worksheet with comments on each candidate's performance: this is not appropriate.

Significant numbers of cassettes were not rewound (having to do this is incredibly time-consuming for the OCR examiners)! Quite a number of Centres did not follow standard recommended practice, namely, of recording two candidates to a side, thereby causing a lot of time to be wasted (again with forwarding/rewinding cassettes), and in one large Centre, a separate tape was forwarded for every candidate.

A feature which received mention by markers more frequently than usually, was the failure to announce candidates adequately at the start of their interview. There is a clear procedure and it would be most helpful if all Teacher/examiners could follow it.

Once again, a sizeable number of recordings were poor in quality: feedback from the microphone; bumping noises as if the microphone were being moved; doors banging; loud buzzing / humming; the sound fading; conversations in an adjacent room – as well as the 'normal' quota of recordings punctuated by bells, sirens, loudspeaker announcements or accompanied by nearby playground frenzy. Centres must make every effort to guarantee the best quality of recording, in order to give the best advantage to the candidates.

2655 – French Listening, Reading and Writing 2

General Comments

The paper discriminated well and marks spanned the whole range. Many candidates showed a good understanding of the texts they heard or read and in the listening exercises there were fewer transcription errors than last year. Most candidates attempted all sections of the paper -- there were very few unanswered questions.

There was a lot of evidence of good and appropriate preparation, with many candidates performing relatively evenly over the different skills. Many candidates displayed sound knowledge of topical vocabulary and complex structures but what most candidates find difficult to achieve is accuracy of language. Candidates had difficulties with the spelling of “bilingual words” eg. adresse, prolifération, polémique, sanction, pénale, pédiatre, autonomie, sceptiques and électricité. “Texting language”, which of course is not rewarded, has started to appear e.g. “FCC” for *faire cesser*. Some candidates have the tendency to write too much and thus lose marks, because if a question requires two elements in the answer only the first two elements of the answer will be taken into consideration; it is thus important that the candidates read the questions carefully and respond concisely but completely. They should be reminded, especially regarding the last task, that it is quality of the language which is important rather than quantity.

In some cases, poor handwriting and presentation made it very difficult for examiners to judge whether the candidate had given the correct answer. Some candidates still use tippex or write in pencil. Candidates should be vigorously encouraged to write legibly and present their work neatly; candidates with specific learning difficulties which affect their handwriting (e.g. dysgraphia, dyslexia, dyspraxia etc...) should be discussed with the Special Requirements division of OCR.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A Task 1 was usually better done than task 2. Many candidates tried to write down everything they heard, regardless of whether it was appropriate or whether they understood it, producing as a consequence much garbled French.

Task 1

- (a) Candidates often left out *dynamiser* and those who did mention it often spelt the word incorrectly but most scored the point attached to *plus de confiance*. A certain number of candidates, however, offered distorted versions either because they wrote *restaureur/render/restaurant* or because they had understood *cours* rather than *courses*. Those who understood the text and could not spell *instaurer* got round the problem by using *donner/offrir*.

Report on the Units Taken in June 2005

- (b) The majority managed *doivent indiquer leur identité* but *coordonnées* was sometimes given as *coordinnées* and sometimes figured as 2 separate words eg. *cours donnés/coeur donné/corps donné*. A few answered with “the double click rule” etc. and scored only one of the two marks available. Some had difficulties conjugating ‘devoir’; some candidates resorted to ‘il faut’, sometimes losing a mark for vagueness as a result.
- (c) The majority understood the information required. However, some had problems with the possessive adjective and the personal pronoun or the transcription of *préalable* (e.g. *près à liable/ après lable*) in the second half of the answer.
- (d) This question was less well done. Many attempted transcriptions of the sentence *Un amendement laisse quand même la possibilité aux entreprises de faire des mailings commerciaux sous certaines conditions* or they referred to *sanctions pénales*. Some of those who gave the correct answer had problems transcribing *hébergeurs et fournisseurs d'accès* even though these words were in the question.
- (e) Many candidates struggled with the verb *engager* which they did not always understand and which they attempted to combine with versions of *s'ils ont connaissance d'un délit et qu'ils n'agissent pas promptement*. *Surveiller* was not always spelt correctly eg. *surveyer*.
- (d) Well done in the main. There were lots of *menace à liberté*, which did, of course, distort the meaning and, in the second part, many candidates could not spell *insuffisante* correctly. *Droits d'auteurs* was sometimes misinterpreted as *utilisateurs/d'autres* or even *les doigts des autres* etc... which did result in the mark being forfeited.

Task 2

The second task was an effective differentiator, with the full range of marks being awarded, as success here required grammatical awareness combined with some thought. The listening skill was tested effectively. Some candidates did not listen carefully enough, and suggested that carbon dioxide was a source of energy, rather than a by-product of combustion.

- (a) Despite misspellings of *fossiles*, most qualified for this mark. *ConsUmmation*, which resulted in the mark being forfeited, did figure but not commonly. Some candidates erroneously selected “le réchauffement climatique” as their sole answer. “Le pétrole” suffered regular misspelling, as did “le charbon” though to a lesser extent.

- (b) This proved to be very testing, as candidates had to be clear what was to replace what; this is an apt reminder of the importance of listening carefully to the smaller words.
There were a lot of meaningless answers because *la substitution du gaz au pétrole* (correct answer) was given as *la substitution du gaz ou pétrole*. The second part yielded a greater proportion of correct solutions but some candidates did not understand the text as they gave either the wrong subject (*le charbon est inégalement réparti*) or simply *il y a des pays qui ont beaucoup de charbon*. *Une ressource* tended to lose a letter *s*, or be written as *une source*, and the verb *répartir* was not well known.
- (c) Answers here often focussed on *les énergies renouvelables* and *le nucléaire*. Some went on to target the correct part of the text but transcriptions of what had been heard were frequently too flawed for the point to be awarded: *en sortie de* was the main stumbling block and *stocker* was often incorrectly spelt or the pronoun was left out.
- (d) There was a vast number of answers to this question, and some candidates took the wrong route involving *des incertitudes* and *ça ne peut faire qu'une partie du travail*. A significant number of candidates gave as their answer the material required for the previous question. Answers like *La France est une centrale nucléaire* or *la France utilise la/une centrale nucléaire* implying that France has only one nuclear plant, were not accepted. A few weaker candidates laboured under the misapprehension that *le gaz carbonique* is used in the manufacture of electricity.
- (e) Quite a few did get this right but many had not understood *croissent* and gave answers that were either meaningless (eg. *A cause des émissions croisse*) or which omitted the concept of growth altogether (eg. *Les transports émettent beaucoup de gaz carbonique*). Better candidates used *augmenter* if they were stuck. Another error that figured in a number of scripts was the transcription of **dont** *les émissions croissent* as **dans** *les émissions croissent*.
- (f) A number of answers were rendered meaningless because the subject of the verb *dépendre* was given as *elles/ils* and quite a lot of candidates had clearly not registered the crucial *comment* and gave answers of the sort *Elles dépendent de l'électricité fabriquée*.
- (g) Most had understood the essential information here though a certain number omitted *émissions*.

Task 3

This task required a certain degree of reflection, with a variety of responses being acceptable for several of the answers. A surprising number of language errors surfaced here.

- 1 Usually correctly answered, but too many just gave the infinitive and a few illustrated their miscomprehension by supplying *augmente* or the like.

Report on the Units Taken in June 2005

- 2 Invented forms of the sort *bénéficial* were common and a lot gave answers such as *bien* and *une bonne idée* which did not communicate the fact that *la scolarisation précoce* is a positive advantage. Few know the difference between *meilleur* and *mieux*.
 - 3 Usually correct though many errors of verb form, eg. *été né, était né, est née* and often along with an erroneous feminine singular agreement.
 - 4 There was an assortment of inappropriate answers which had no bearing for either communication or the part of speech e.g. *scolarisé*. Number and gender of 'enfants' was often ignored. *Tout de suite/immédiatement* figured quite often and a certain number of candidates thought that the plural of *tout* was *touts*.
 - 5 Many candidates provided the correct word but the majority were unable to supply the correct subjunctive form of the verb *réfléchir*. Again, too many were happy to give the infinitive. In some case the answer was distorted by additions like *le gouvernement/les parents/l'école*.
- Task 4
- Good candidates scored highly here but weaker candidates frequently struggled. Even when they did chose the correct word or phrase, they often added or omitted words and copying errors of the sort *proprice* and *language* also cost them points.
- (a) Mostly correct.
 - (b) The most common errors were the omission of the preposition *à* or the addition of *pas*.
 - (c) The most common errors were the use of *défavorables* which is a plural word or *défavorable* which was not in the text.
 - (d) The most common error was the omission of the verb.
 - (e) The most common error was the omission of the verb or the addition of *et de chaleur*.
- Task 5
- This is the task the candidates found the most difficult and which discriminated the most with a full range of marks being scored, and where many failed to take the opportunity to display their good language skills. In this exercise candidates were required to give a definition of two words in each of the phrases and not an interpretation of each phrase. One surprising feature was the extent of the use of the exact key words from the stimuli, for which candidates could not expect to be rewarded. Also some candidates seemed to have been trained to explain the second idea only, leaving the 1st in the original version.
- (a) This was probably the question that had the most success. However, *précoce* was sometimes given as *tôt* (t.c.) which was ambiguous in the context, and sometimes candidates were not sufficiently specific about the age of the children in question (eg. *jeunes enfants, enfants de moins de 5/6 ans*).

Report on the Units Taken in June 2005

- (b) This was perhaps the least well done section of this question, as candidates resorted to examples rather than to alternative renderings. There was a lot of description of bad environments, as well as mentions of ways of life which implied that there had been a choice. A lot of candidates talked about social problems such as *le chômage* and *la drogue* but failed to explain either of the 2 elements contained in the phrase *conditions sociales + défavorables*.
- (c) Most candidates conveyed the element of difficulty but were not sufficiently precise about what was difficult.
- (d) Quite well done but there were quite a few whose definition of success was too restrictive (eg. *ne pas redoubler*) or some who used anglicisms (eg. *Succéder/success*).
- (e) This item was substantially more difficult than it looked, and sometimes an element of choice on the part of the child was implied. There was a variety of interpretations of *la sociabilité*, many of them both ingenious and correct. A number of candidates suggested that the child did not have enough people to talk to or play with. However *socialiser* was a popular choice and lengthy explanations yielded few marks. *Manquer* proved particularly troublesome to explain.

Task 6

Some candidates in this exercise lost marks by writing too much, as elements beyond the number required were not taken into consideration. The mark allocation gives the candidate an indication of how many elements/details are required. Weak and very weak candidates sometimes collected almost half of their total score here and good candidates often managed scores of 15 and more

- (a) The word *ateliers* was not well known but the most common mistake was the understanding of *lit individuel* as *read on their own*. *Peluche* was correctly given by about half of the candidates but a lot wrote *things*. Some understood that the teachers were *motivating* rather than *motivated* and by far the commonest rendering of *décidées* was *dedicated* or *decisive*.
- (b) *Effectif* was not understood by the majority of candidates: *atmosphere* was the most popular translation. However, the 3 qualities required of the staff were generally given correctly. *The teachers pay attention* was a popular interpretation, without suggesting the focus of that attention.
- (c) Most understood the phrase *possibilités de socialisation, de découvertes et de jeux* but a few were guilty of kaleidoscoping the last 2 elements which resulted in *the discovery of games* or *playing new games*. The most problematic element proved to be *autonomie* which yielded suggestions ranging from individuality to anonymity. Invented words of the sort *autonomy* and *autonomousness* or even *anatomy* sometimes figured. *Making big progress* was often left out.
- (d) From this point onwards, this exercise became notably easier, relatively few marks being lost. This item was almost universally correct.

- (e) Again, this presented no problems for most but a certain number strayed into the area of loneliness and/or failed to specify that it was often their FIRST separation from the mother or contented themselves with references to traumatisation.
- (f) The vast majority scored the point.

Task 7

The source material was found by candidates to be particularly accessible and relevant, and thus there was greater success in this question than heretofore. However, candidates often tried to stay too close to the English, and found themselves being steered by that language, rather than finding a way around the problem by using French in which they were confident. There was clear evidence of residual vocabulary knowledge of crime and the legal system in French, with some pleasing additions enhancing the quality. Candidates tended to fall directly into one of two groups: one which easily achieved the ten comprehension points, or another which fell well short.

Candidates showed interest in the text and had lots to write especially in question (g) where many went well over the 80 words and, unfortunately, making more mistakes. Candidates should be encouraged to stick to the number of words required as quality of language is better than quantity.

The better candidates were armed with the requisite vocabulary and structures but at the other end of the spectrum communication was decidedly poor and the most basic grammatical errors were frequent (eg. Gender and agreement errors, wrong tense or verb ending). When it came to giving their opinions, some had clearly been told to deploy as many subjunctives as possible and many over-did it, having recourse to the subjunctive after such structures as *je pense que* and *je crois que*. Some couldn't cope with the future or conditional both of which were required to answer questions a to f. Tenses often incorrect with 'si' and 'quand'. Some candidates had been drilled in useful phrases, which worked well for good candidates but made the scripts of poorer candidates even more confusing.

- (a) A mention of the new law was often missed, while the concept of insulting a teacher brought about a lot of distorted French renderings. Some candidates also had difficulties rendering *land in jail / sentenced*.
- (b) Candidates had difficulties rendering *human right associations/magistrates/ rising/re-establish order*. The government's insistence on the necessity of the measures was often well-expressed, but candidates failed to cover all four supplementary facts. It sometimes escaped the candidates' attention that it was only certain schools where order had to be restored, while others suggested that the schools were certain about this.
- (c) Plenty of comprehension points were scored in this section, particularly with the two age references but candidates had difficulties rendering *frequent young offenders/youth detention centre /family allowances*.
- (d) Candidates had difficulties rendering *scepticism/will actually work/the League of Human Rights*.

Report on the Units Taken in June 2005

- (e) This was perhaps the least successful item in this question in terms of candidate responses, as the immigrant families were often mentioned but not always correctly located. Candidates had difficulties rendering *run down housing estates*.
- (f) Candidates had difficulties rendering *stupefying/gap/harden* and some did not understand the meaning of the word *syndicat* in the question.
- (g) The subject engaged candidates very well as many wrote with conviction, even passion. Some got carried away and produced answers of an excessive length; those candidates would do well to remember that quality is rewarded over quantity.

Sometimes the reaction to the text amounted to no more than reiterating the points contained on the first page: a lot copied out wholesale sentences from the previous page prefixing them with *je suis d'accord* or *je ne suis pas d'accord* but offering very little, if anything, by way of justification or exemplification. A number of candidates added chunks of pre-learned essays on hooliganism and vandalism and there were a few on racism, including the issue of the veil. Other candidates wisely viewed the question as an opportunity to air the supplementary vocabulary and constructions that they had retained from studying this area.

2656 : Culture and Society (Written Examination)

General Comments

From candidates sitting this examination in the June 2005 session, slightly more answers were received on non-literary topics than on literary texts/topics. On the whole, candidates who answered the non-literary questions were reasonably well-armed with relevant facts and information, and therefore were in no way disadvantaged in relation to those answering literary questions in respect of mark grid 6A1. It should nevertheless be repeated that candidates answering non-literary questions are expected to refer to specific facts and figures just as those choosing literary questions should refer to specific incidents (ideally, quotations) from their chosen text.

The number of rubric offences was relatively small. Happily this is the exception rather than the rule, but Centres should still ensure that any candidate sitting the examination is aware of the correct format.

Literary context questions were tackled by candidates of all ability levels, and many excellent answers were received. However, there was a tendency for candidates at times to be too theoretical in answers, and to make inadequate reference either to the extract itself or to incidents from elsewhere in the text which might have been used to support arguments. It should be emphasised that for these questions, precise factual knowledge of the relevant parts of the text is expected.

Essays on prescribed texts generally demonstrated a sound knowledge of the chosen text, and in many cases an impressive understanding of literary and social issues forming the background to it. There were, however, also plenty of cases where candidates resorted simply to story-telling without really offering any analysis or, in the worst cases, without making much attempt to address the question. Few candidates chose to answer the literary topics questions, but of those who did, suitability of the text for the particular question was a key factor in their degree of success. Some texts had to be rather forced into fitting the question and these answers tended to suffer in terms of relevancy.

Most of the non-literary questions were attempted, and many first class answers were received, full of relevant fact with a clear and logical argument appropriate to the question. Certain questions, however, were attempted, it appeared, out of desperation, with little information being imparted. Too frequently, candidates paid only lip service to the actual question and produces "all-I-know" style essays on particular topics, or, worse still, general essays on the topic with very little reference to the target country; nor was it uncommon for even good candidates to fall into the trap of writing too much, thereby moving to and fro between relevance and irrelevance, and causing the logical progression of essays to suffer as a consequence.

In conclusion, it was felt that standards were generally similar to past years, but that the great majority of candidates had clearly prepared very well for the examination. Quality of language (see below) inevitably varied, but candidates with relatively weak language skills were still able to achieve very competent marks if they demonstrated a good knowledge of the text or topic. Finally, one point made by a number of examiners – standards of handwriting are deteriorating and some scripts require almost hieroglyphic skills to decipher!

Comments on Individual Questions

Q No) (sub)

Section A: Prescribed literary texts

- 1)
 - (a) Anouilh: *Antigone*
This question was answered generally competently, with accurate reference to relevant parts of the text. Part (ii) was the least well answered, with candidates tending to waffle, write too much and lose the thread of their argument. The importance of Œdipe *in absentia* for the understanding of the attitudes of the two main characters was not always made clear.
 - (b) This question was generally answered very well with good character studies of one or, in the case of the best candidates, the two main characters, offering a comparison between their respective qualities. Most candidates chose Antigone as the most admirable character, despite her stubbornness and selfishness, but often her refusal to compromise was omitted as a reason for this choice. Better candidates made good use of appropriate quotation, but some succumbed to the temptation to refer to every character: one essay which compared Antigone and Créon very skilfully, was adversely affected by its final page which made not only Hémon but also Ismène, the Nurse, the Page and even Eurydice contenders for “the most admirable character award”.
- 2)
 - (a) Camus: *L'Étranger*
This question was popular with candidates and produced many good answers or, many answers that were good at least in parts. Candidates do clearly have a good knowledge of the text and the basis of an understanding of its finer points. There were however omissions, and candidates who in part (iii) failed to mention Meursault's violent reaction to what the priest says at the end of the extract inevitably fell down on factual knowledge. Answers to part (ii) brought a variety of interpretations but most were perfectly admissible, although candidates failed to take the opportunity to relate this comment to the choice of title for the novel.
 - (b) An extremely popular question which brought many good answers as candidates demonstrated a mostly very thorough knowledge of the text. The majority of candidates chose to undertake a close analysis of Meursault's trial and referred effectively to “la justice injuste”, remarking on the theatrical nature of the proceedings and Meursault's role as a virtual spectator at his own trial. An example of good practice in making the key point succinctly was the following: “La justice ne dépend pas de la vérité, comme on aurait pensé, mais elle dépend de comment on peut présenter ses arguments.” Most essays were at least adequate, but perhaps slightly confused the notions of justice and judgement. The best candidates also made very effective reference to the difference between man's justice and god's justice. While the text is clearly being well taught by Centres, few candidates seem to be aware of its fundamental ambiguity, and comments such as “Meursault est condamné à mort non pour le meurtre de l'Arabe mais parce qu'il n'a pas pleuré à l'enterrement de sa mère” were very widespread and tended to offer a rather too simplistic interpretation of the text.

Report on the Units Taken in June 2005

- 3 Giono: *Regain*
- (a) While only a few candidates answered on this text, the context question was generally well answered with a sound knowledge of the text being displayed. The notion of the restoration of order was understood by those who attempted this question, and answers on Mamèche's hypothetical reaction to the repopulation of the village showed good insight.
- (b) Very few answers to this question were attempted. Candidates who did attempt it often tended to miss the point, failing to demonstrate adequately the hardships and misery encountered by the peasants in the novel (at least, in the first part) and concentrating on how much more regarding country life was compared to an urban existence. There was also little reference to the need for man to live in harmony with nature, or the lack of normal social conventions amongst the peasants. Essays therefore often contained major omissions and had an unbalanced structure.
- 4 Mauriac: *Le Nœud de Vipères*
- Extremely few candidates answered on this text. Those who did, generally demonstrated a sound knowledge and understanding of the text.
- 5 Molière: *Le Misanthrope*
- (a) This context question was competently answered in general, but a number of candidates failed to take the opportunity available to them in part (ii) to demonstrate how Alceste's behaviour in this extract was typical of him. Many other episodes from the play could have been quoted in support of this but candidates often overlooked this chance to demonstrate a thorough knowledge of the text. Philinte's role was generally well understood, but in part (iii) answers tended to be too one-sided rather than balancing the arguments for and against.
- (b) Answers to this question tended to be sound but rather uninspired. Few candidates considered Alceste in relation to his peers, and may concentrated on the tragic side of his character, ignoring the potential for humour. Better candidates did however produce some very convincing answers to this question, using specific examples to argue whether Alceste's rigorous principles were praiseworthy or simply ridiculous in the society in which he lived, and comparing these with the easy morality of the other characters, especially Célimène.
- 6 Proust: *Un amour de Swann*
- (a) Very few answers to this question were received. Candidates displayed little in the way of relevant knowledge of the text or the characters, and answers were often irrelevant and inadequate.
- (b) No answers on this question were received.

- 7 Sartre: *Les Mains sales*
- (a) Answers to this question varied considerably in quality. The better candidates were able to place the extract correctly in its context and produced interesting answers to parts (ii) and especially (iii), where the relevance of Hoederer's remark to the whole question of existentialism was demonstrated. Unfortunately, candidates did tend to lean too heavily on this theoretical interpretation rather than examining the significance of the remark for the action of the play itself. Similarly, many candidates overlooked the fact that Hugo was actually in possession of a gun, and consequently what the effect of Hugo's not having to be searched would ultimately be. Less able candidates produced some very weak and superficial answers; it may be the case that this text is not best suited to those at the lower end of the ability scale.
- (b) Very few candidates chose this question. Answers tended to tell the story rather than analyse Hugo's character, but generally displayed a reasonable knowledge of the play, understanding that Hugo's reaction comes from the fact that, the Party having now shifted its stance to exactly what Hoederer was previously advocating, he realises that he has killed for no political purpose.
- 8 Voltaire: *Candide*
- (a) Answers on this question demonstrated a sound knowledge of the text but lacked any real powers of interpretation or analysis. Part (iii) was particularly weak, consistently failing to point out the comic effect of *Candide's* killings compared to his personality and philosophy, missing the ironic and satirical aspects of the *conte*. Some relevant comments about disproving Pangloss' theories of Optimism were made.
- (b) More answers were received on the Voltaire essay question, and this was one of the best-answered questions on the entire paper. Essays demonstrated a full understanding of the background to the *conte* and Voltaire's attitudes towards Leibniz and the philosophy of Optimism, religion, war, etc., while also making many relevant references to incidents from the text and to the author's narrative technique and use of irony. At the very top end, some candidates included reference to the nature of the *conte philosophique* as a genre. It is clear that this text has been very well taught by Centres, and those candidates who selected this essay question made full use of the knowledge they had acquired.

Section B: Literary topics

- 9 The few candidates who attempted the question on young people mostly chose to use *Candide* or *Antigone*. While either of these texts could have been used quite successfully in response to this question, the notion of 'idealism' was either not fully understood or more or less disregarded. An interesting choice was Azouz Begag's *Le Gone du Chaâba*, and answers on this text were impressive, picking up the notion of childish ideals and their positive/negative outcomes very successfully.

Report on the Units Taken in June 2005

- 10 *Le Gone du Chaâba* was also used for this question, but more commonly, Lainé's *La Dentellière* was the preferred text. This contains a number of feminine characters whose independence could be analysed. There were some very good answers demonstrating the characters' independence (or lack thereof) in relation to men, but many answers were rather simplistic character sketches and/or narrative accounts of the plot, with arguments concerning the question tending to be thin and superficial.
- 11 This was by far the most popular of the literary topics questions. *Candide* was used more than once – without great success, as there is little 'bien' in its portrayal of war. The two most used texts for this question were Vercors' *Le Silence de la Mer* and Maupassant's *Boule de Suif et autres contes de la guerre*. Essays on the former tended to be rather narrative and often failed to address the question with sufficient relevance - probably not an ideal text for this question. The latter could have been an excellent choice as there are examples of bravery, patriotism and loyalty alongside the inhumanity, cruelty and destruction of war. Some candidates did refer to these, but essays were often let down by a misunderstanding of the notions of 'le bien' and 'le mal', interpreting these as applying to characters (i.e. 'goodies and baddies') rather than qualities. Also, it should be said that when the chosen text is a series of short stories, more than one such story really needs to be referred to in order for the answer not to be seen as containing significant omissions.
- 12 *Le Misanthrope* and *Cyrano de Bergerac* were the two most commonly chosen texts for this question. Both contain material that could be used relevantly to discuss the theme of cruelty in love, but essays were generally of the type that tends to force the subject matter to fit the title, although some good arguments were put forward in the case of *Cyrano*. Attempts to use *L'Étranger* to answer this question met, unsurprisingly, with limited success.
- 13 *Le Misanthrope*, *L'Étranger* and *Antigone* were used to answer his question. Of these, only the first really seemed appropriate, and even then it is debatable as to what extent Alceste thinks he can influence society. In the other two cases, neither Meursault nor Antigone, while certainly individuals, wish to influence society. Candidates tended often to answer a different question, i.e. "Est-ce que l'individu influence la société ?", and to overlook the fact that the individual's beliefs and intentions were a significant aspect of the question.
- 14 Two unusual texts, *Le Gone du Chaâba* and Annie Ernaux's *La Place* were used effectively to answer this question, with both the physical and social/psychological interpretations of liberty and imprisonment being considered. An attempt to use *Un Amour de Swann* in which the milieu was considered to be simply "art" was one of the more "unexpected" answers received, sadly not containing very much in the way of textual knowledge to support its ingenuity.

Section C: Non-literary topics

- 15 (a) Very few candidates attempted this question, and almost all answers were poor. Little real knowledge of the French press was demonstrated, and answers were general and superficial, failing to define adequately the meaning of the key terms in the title or to refer to specific publications.
- (b) Similarly, this question appears to have been attempted mostly by a few candidates who were struggling to find an alternative question to answer. This led to poor essays, low on factual content and with little in the way of a coherent argument. Candidates were unable to name a single French radio station programme!
- 16 (a) There were two quite distinct approaches to this question. One was to examine the nature of diplomas that young French people were receiving (normally discussing the 'bac') and to demonstrate their lack of relevance to the current job market; the other was to say that while these useless diplomas were a factor (and say little more about them), there were a number of other far more significant causes of unemployment among the young. Either approach could be used perfectly satisfactorily, but only the best candidates combined the two. This question was very popular with candidates and attracted answers from all points along the ability scale: stronger candidates showed a sound knowledge of government initiatives to help young people through training schemes, and also addressed the question of ethnicity and social background; at the lower end, there was an evident dearth of relevant factual knowledge and much generalisation, and for several, this proved to be a poor choice of question.
- (b) Answers to this question tended to show relatively little knowledge or understanding of the key issues and often were general, superficial or irrelevant. Issues such as unemployment, social deprivation, lack of leisure facilities etc. were notable by their absence.
- 17 (a) The two directors selected for this question were Truffaut and Jeunet. Candidates showed a good knowledge of the films but some failed to relate their essays to the question of originality. In this respect, those who answered on Truffaut fared better and were able to refer to technical innovations and the *Nouvelle Vague*: many wrote lively, interesting and relevant essays. Technical cinematographic vocabulary was often used to good effect, and evidence of serious academic study of the films was clearly present. At other times, however, while many valid points were made, these were insufficiently linked to the question title, and weaker candidates resorted to a preponderance of story-telling. It should also be pointed out that reference to fewer than 3 films is a rubric infringement and is considered a significant omission.
- (b) Few candidates attempted this question, although Gérard Depardieu did receive some attention. Answers tended to be more descriptive than analytical, and often insufficient knowledge was demonstrated to allow an adequate essay to be written.

- 18 (a) Relatively few candidates attempted this question, but some good answers were received, which showed a competent knowledge of the threats to animals in France, although mostly these looked at cruelty (e.g. battery farming) rather than actual threats of extinction of species, which was an area reserved for only the best candidates, who showed awareness of particular species under threat and some of initiatives to protect them. Some good arguments were presented, with effective conclusions such as: “La protection des espèces est un enjeu global et un problème partagé. A moins qu’il ne soit résolu, l’avenir de notre terre reste incertain.” Interesting statistics about wolves and bears were presented in fascinating, if not especially wide-reaching essays. Too many essays however were very general about animal welfare and made little reference to France.
- (b) This was a popular question, often well-answered with plenty of relevant facts, figures and subject-specific vocabulary. However, too frequently the subject of France’s independence in terms of energy was only briefly mentioned, and knowledge of alternative sources of energy available to France was scant. Too much time was spent on issues of only peripheral relevance, such as the dangers of nuclear accidents and methods of disposal of nuclear waste. This question did also attract a number of weaker candidates who possessed little in the way of relevant knowledge and produced answers with a lot of waffle.
- 19 (a) There were few answers to this question, and even fewer good ones. The term ‘cultural identity’ was misunderstood by many, and even those who did manage a relevant answer usually failed to address the question of its importance to the local population. Some candidates basically tried to write down all they knew about the town or region in the hope that some of the facts might prove relevant to the question.
- (b) This was a more popular question and produced some good answers with well-chosen facts and figures, but many candidates simply wrote down any problems they could think of, irrespective of whether these were related to the geographical situation or not. Reference to climate was common, and while not wholly irrelevant, seldom fitted neatly into a coherent argument. Some essays appeared to disregard the question almost entirely and offer a kind of superficial travelogue with no discernible argument.
- 20 (a) A very popular question, with many candidates showing a sound knowledge of the problems facing immigrants in France today, but often without really addressing the key point of how successfully they are integrated into mainstream society. Weaker candidates tended to ramble, and be superficial and thin on content, generalising about “des conflits dans les banlieues chaudes”, and little more - nothing specific, no exact examples of the police victimising young Muslims, nor any reference to the inflammatory policies of the *Front National* or the good work of *SOS Racisme*. The best candidates were able to give facts and figures of numbers of immigrants in low-paid jobs. Many referred to “le foulard” but some never got past 1989 and Creil. More recent reforms did not appear to be known.

- (b) Answers to this question tended to be unconvincing as candidates were too vague in their answers and generally failed to refer to any specific examples of clashes between the forces of order and young immigrants in France. They did display some awareness of the justifiable grievances that young immigrants might have, but this only really answered half the question – little or no reference to heavy-handed policing (and possibly racism by the police) in predominantly immigrant communities was made.
- 21 (a) A very popular question. Answers were often very knowledgeable, producing the necessary statistics (often many and startling) required by the statement to set up their answer and mentioning quite a wide range of possible explanations, such as ignorance, drug abuse, lack of sex education and the rate of immigration from African countries where AIDS was rife (seized upon as the only reason by some rather desperate candidates). On the other hand, many were superficial and contained little reference to France. Surprisingly, very few candidates referred to the anti-birth control teachings of the Roman Catholic Church.
- (b) Another popular question, for which most (but not all) candidates were equipped with what would seem to be the very minimum needed to attempt an adequate answer, i.e. knowledge of the *Loi Evin*. The very best candidates covered a lot of ground, making this law the lynch-pin of their argument and expanding the discussion to cover other recent government and EU strategy, such as warnings on cigarette packets, etc. They quoted percentages of smokers/non-smokers – the effects of the law and the avoidance of it. Weaker candidates generalised about smoking in general, and spoke in general terms about pregnant women and passive-smoking, referring only very rarely to France.

Quality of Language

As one would expect, quality of language varied greatly. Plenty of candidates demonstrated an impressive ability to write very accurate French of considerable ambitiousness and complexity, maintaining their accuracy even in the most demanding of constructions. At the other extreme, there are still a fair number of candidates whose language can only be assessed as poor, showing little feel for the language except in pre-learned phrases and struggling to maintain accuracy in even the simplest of original constructions. Irregular verbs, genders and adjectival agreements were still very inconsistently applied by many candidates. It is worrying at this level to see candidates regularly confusing 'on' and 'ont', or 'son' and 'sont'.

In reality, of course, the majority of candidates lie between those two extremes. Most were able to produce language which could reasonably be considered to be appropriate for the task, and even if many of the advanced constructions used, such as subjunctives, may not be exactly spontaneous language, they do at least demonstrate knowledge of and ability to incorporate such grammar into their written work.

Report on the Units Taken in June 2005

The majority of errors occur when candidates seek to express complex ideas in French and try to translate literally from English. Use of expressions such as 'dont' and 'lequel/laquelle' cause regular problems in verb constructions using 'de' and 'à'. Attempts to form phrases like 'ce dont ils ont besoin' and 'un problème auquel ils doivent faire face' were seldom successful ('facier' has become a popular choice of verb!)

Other very common faults were the use of 'des autres' instead of 'd'autres', 'dans une manière/façon' rather than 'd'une', and the incorrect use of the imperfect of 'être' in past tense passive constructions.

Finally – and importantly for those studying *Antigone* – the ability to conjugate the verb 'compromettre' (or to produce its noun form) was almost non-existent, suggesting that candidates are perhaps not fully aware of the concept of compound verbs.

2657: French Culture and Society - Coursework

General Comments

Many Moderators commented on the great variety of topics and titles and on how pleasing it was to read genuine attempts to reach personal and informed conclusions, often written in clear and controlled French. Of course, the full range of ability was represented but there was little sub-standard work this year. As ever, candidates must be praised for the care they take over the presentation of their work, which makes moderating a more enjoyable task. On the practical side, there seems to be a little confusion as to which documents should or should not be sent to the Moderator with the work.

Topics

In the spirit of coursework, and in a desire to allow candidates genuine freedom of choice, Centres submitted a wide range of suitable topics, all clearly linked to the francophone world. However, in a minority of cases, mostly on literary topics, all candidates were allowed to write on variations of the same titles. This did not promote individual research or originality, as it only encouraged them to reproduce class notes. Such practice must be avoided: the aim of coursework is to encourage independent work and study, albeit guided by the teacher (Coursework Guidance, section 3.3). Centres wishing to prepare candidates in such a way should think of entering them for the essay paper rather than for the coursework option. This point was made in last year's report.

Approximately 20% of Centres submitted at least some work based on literary texts. These provide eminently suitable areas to study to fulfil the AO4 requirement of this unit. The traditional favourite authors were much in evidence again (Camus, Pagnol, de Maupassant, Sartre, Joffo, Anouilh, Molière but also Mauriac, Sagan, Vercors, Zola, Rochefort, Troyat etc.), all providing plenty of scope to display knowledge and analytical skills. It was disappointing to note that many Centres used the set texts from 2656 as the basis of their coursework literary studies instead of taking full advantage of the flexibility of this option to explore a wider range of suitable texts.

Of the non-literary topics, social issues, especially those relating to immigration and racism were most popular, with the topical subject of *laïcité/islam* top of the list. Politics and religion also attracted many candidates. Gaining in popularity was the study of various aspects of colonisation/DOM-TOM. Other social issues such as *le chômage*, *les SDF*, *la parité* were less common this year. Films and cinema (*La Nouvelle Vague*, *Truffaut*, *Jeunet*, *Besson*, *Kassovitz*) seemed to attract more candidates. The danger here, as with the study of famous people (*Gustave Eiffel*, *Lucie Aubrac*, *Evariste Galois*, *Pierre Boulez* ...) or historical characters (*Napoléon*, *Robespierre*, *Charles de Gaulle*, *Guillaume le Conquérant*, *Marie de Médicis* ...), is to drift into narrative and forfeit marks under Grid 6A2. Nevertheless, when candidates were aware of, and able to steer way from, this potential pitfall, they often managed to produce memorable pieces, thanks to their originality and clarity of insight. Finally environmental issues also featured, but less frequently than in previous years. This may be because candidates preferred to explore unusual themes of specific interest to them.

Titles

Titles were generally better chosen than in the past, often giving scope for developing an argument and making a case. There were fewer purely descriptive titles, but any is too many. Titles such as « *Le problème de la pollution et ses effets sur les Alpes* », « *Quels sont les problèmes que les jeunes doivent affronter en France ?* », « *Gustave Eiffel : un bâtisseur mal connu* », « *Napoléon Bonaparte* », or « *Charles de Gaulle – ce qui l’a motivé* », « *L’importance de la Résistance* » ... must be avoided. Quite a lot of clearly able candidates underperformed because their title had no identifiable goal beyond description/narration.

Phrasing the title as a question is a good idea, but not if the question does not lead to analysis (« *Comment Pasteur a pu changer notre vie de tous les jours ?* », « *Quelles sont les attitudes exprimées envers la police dans La Haine ?* » ; « *Pourquoi St Barthélemy est-elle une île populaire ?* ») or if it is one eliciting much descriptive information, since it does not admit of a real answer (« *Est-il possible que le Canada soit un pays dont rêvent beaucoup de Français ?* »). Another type of title which can lead to underperformance is one that involves two questions (« *Dans quelle mesure est-ce que Sartre montre que la torture mutuelle est inévitable dans les rapports humains ? Est-ce que cette idée clé mène à une pièce réussie ?* »). When faced with the task of answering two questions, the candidate often skimpily treated one of them or even completely forgot one of the two. Sometimes, it seemed as if the candidate had not fully understood his/her title, possibly because it had been suggested by the teacher, rather than being of the candidate's own choosing (« *Dans quelle mesure l'impressionnisme a-t-il révolutionné l'art français ?* », « *Renoir et l'impressionnisme – ne mérite-t-il pas mieux que de finir sur des boîtes de chocolats ?* »)

The warning many times given about the hazards of allowing candidates to embark upon essays in the form of letters, diaries, newspaper articles, interviews or brochures must be reiterated. Before embarking upon such projects, teachers should make sure that the object of writing such a piece is obvious not only to the candidate but also to the unknown reader – the Moderator. At the planning stage, it would be productive to ask them what they want to prove in their piece of work and then to try to include this aim as a subtitle; otherwise the end product is likely to end up as a narrative account which cannot be given high marks on 6A2 (see Coursework Guidance, section 4.2)

Manner of submission

Plan

Apart from a few examples written in English which should not be accepted, plans fall into two categories: the good ones, consisting of a series of headings and subheadings and which show the shape of the argument to be developed in the essay, and the others which do not. These again can be put into two groups: the bullet points type - where candidates list all they intend to cover, showing neither specific order, nor link, nor progression, and the summary type. The latter is becoming more popular and in some cases verges on malpractice. The clear instructions stating that the plan must not be more than one side of A4 are simply flaunted by some candidates and by Centres condoning such practice. Over-long plans must not be accepted. Other candidates manage to stay within one side of A4 but use a point 8 or less font size to pack more words onto the page. This is not acceptable either. Finally, some write mini-essays which are occasionally reproduced verbatim in the full essay. As Centres may comment to candidates on their plans, to submit a plan which is almost an essay in itself is a way of getting advice on the finished product. This goes very much against the regulations/conditions of coursework and must not be entertained.

Such infringements are reported as malpractice. The plan should be printed in the same font size as the essay, i.e. 10 to 12 and conform to the description given in the Coursework Guidance booklet section 5.3)

Bibliography

The very concept of coursework implies that a topic will be researched widely. There was much evidence of personal research, but candidates seemed to prefer searching the Web rather than reading books. It is a good idea to encourage candidates to print copies of main source articles, although it is not necessary to include them with the scripts sent to the Moderator (should the matter come to question, having copies at hand can be very expeditious and time-saving). Some rely on class textbooks or similar; this is fine to get ideas and an overview, but it can be a starting point only. At this level, evidence of further reading and independent research is required.

Acknowledging sources and recording them correctly in the bibliography is improving but far too many do not follow the instructions set out in sections 4.6 and 6.7 of the Coursework Guidance booklet. Finally, a number of candidates rely on sources written in English (often essays on historical, artistic or socio/geographical topics). Such sources may be used, but sparingly, because the temptation is to translate what was read and this invariably results in stilted and anglicised – occasionally meaningless – French. (« *N'essayez pas de me commander autour, je ne vous connais pas, vont juste !* » in an essay on La Haine).

Length

Only a few candidates opted to write two short essays. This option rarely allows candidates to show the depth of knowledge and the quality of analysis necessary to warrant marks in the higher bands of the assessment criteria. Candidates should be made aware of this.

The specification states the upper and lower limits of coursework pieces. This assumes that the word count given by candidates is accurate. Unfortunately, this is not always the case. Centres should be more vigilant because failure to observe word limits results in some sort of penalty: over-long essays lose their conclusions (as they might not be read/taken into account), which will be reflected in the 6A2 mark and short essays are self-penalising for content but also incur a scaling, as shown in section 6.8 of the Coursework Guidance booklet. Quite a number of Centres either failed to apply this scaling or incorrectly applied it to the total mark, as opposed to the language marks (grids 6B) only.

A few instances of very short single essays were reported this year. If the number of words submitted is less than the upper limit of a 'short' essay, such a single essay must be assessed as if it were one of two 'short' essays, with 0 awarded for the missing second piece.

Administrative matters

Most Centres follow administrative procedures scrupulously but clerical errors were not uncommon (incorrect additions on the individual mark sheets or transcription from the mark sheet to MS1 especially). Some Centres are using out-of-date mark sheets and assessment grids. It is possible to download the current version of the various forms from the OCR Website. Centres are reminded that half marks must not be used. Should a half-mark appear as the result of halving the total of the two short essays marks, this must be rounded up and this rounded-up mark is to be entered on MS1. When a request for amendment is made, forms should be returned to the Moderator within the prescribed time span (i.e., as quickly as possible); if not, another request has to be sent, which is wasteful and time-consuming for all parties.

All coursework must be authenticated. The Candidate Authentication Forms should be kept by the Centres, not submitted with the work. However, it is essential that candidates sign their individual mark sheet. Teachers must also authenticate the work. For this purpose one duly completed copy of the Centre Authentication Form must be sent to the Moderator with the work.

A few cover sheets were either missing or incomplete (missing candidate's number, word count or bibliography mostly). Teacher's comments on the cover sheets, though not essential, are welcomed and appreciated by Moderators.

Content

Most candidates had researched their subject well. The major difficulty for some was to select what was actually relevant to their title. The great temptation is to try to use all the information that they have, regardless of its relevance, and to allow the essay to be driven by facts. Factual evidence should be used to illustrate and strengthen the case, not as an end in itself. The best candidates were able to select relevant information and forge it into a strong argument with a convincing conclusion. Some candidates chose topics about which they felt very strongly (euthanasia, homosexual parenting, animal rights etc.); occasionally they allowed their own passionate opinions, often unsupported by factual evidence, to take over and what should have been a controlled argument became an emotional outpouring.

Although teachers are allowed to give advice on structure and content at the planning stage, some do not use this opportunity, possibly because candidates refuse such help. It is to be regretted because such help would ensure that the essay has a balanced argument which develops in a logical way thanks to appropriate progression and linkage. The use of subheadings should not be encouraged as it destroys the natural flow of the argument. In a well structured essay, introduction and conclusion have an important part to play, which not all candidates seem to appreciate. A good introduction needs to be fairly short; it must introduce the title and also engage the reader. Frequently, candidates wait until they reach the conclusion to tackle the question they have set themselves or to express their own views on the subject; a good conclusion should be the natural and logical outcome of the whole essay.

Candidates should remember that, when using language from their sources, quotation marks and footnotes must be used (Coursework Guidance, section 4.6).

Language

Many candidates had a good command of vocabulary and structures and made a genuine effort to introduce complexity in their language. Researching the topic through documents written in French rather than through sources in English should help develop topic-specific vocabulary and a greater awareness of how the language works. However, candidates at the lower end of the range tended to overstretch themselves and ended up using vocabulary and structures with which they could not cope. For them, simpler, more accurate language would have been more beneficial. When candidates look up a word in a dictionary, they should check that they have chosen the correct word. Using a monolingual dictionary would prevent them from writing « *Napoléon a été grêlé un héros* » or « *Les familles aujourd'hui ne sont plus aussi près tricote.* ».

The quality of language, as one might expect, was rather inconsistent. The formation of tenses was generally adequate but there was confusion over using perfect and imperfect tenses, over the sequencing of tenses and over the use of passive and active voice. There was general uncertainty in the use of prepositions and in the formation and position of adverbs. The subjunctive, although generally correctly used, sometimes sounded forced and unnatural. Other common errors included: agreement of adjectives and of past participles; confusion between *c'est* and *il est*, and between *parce que* and *à cause de*; incorrect use of articles; and errors of accents. When candidates try to translate word-for-word from English, the outcome is often meaningless (« *Il doit être vers le haut tôt dans le matin* »).

Assessment

Assessment by Centres was mostly within acceptable limits. Occasionally, small Centres, without the full range of ability, found it more difficult to establish standards. Moderators were grateful for Centres' co-operation in re-assessing occasional pieces that had not been marked at the correct level. This was usually due to an inconsistent application of the assessment grids, mostly 6A1 and 6A2. After having discussed plan and ideas with a candidate, the teacher knows what the candidate is trying to show; it is therefore not unusual for a teacher to read more into an essay than is actually there and to over-reward it.

Grid 6A1 assesses the amount and quality of relevant information displayed by the candidate in supporting his/her case. To gain access to the higher bands, the whole essay has to be focused on answering the title, not merely on referring to it. Too often Centres award marks in the 'Very Good' band to essays which show a great deal of knowledge about the topic but which are only loosely related to the titles. In other words, to be placed in the higher bands an essay must be fully and thoroughly geared towards answering its title. At times, it may be necessary to imply knowledge rather than overstate it. There were a number of 'Excellent' essays, but not as many as teachers thought. At the other end of the scale, hardly any candidates suffered from knowing very little about their subject, although some did not go much beyond general knowledge.

Grid 6A2 rewards the quality of the argument that is developed in the essay. This includes the structure, the linking and development of ideas and the general progression of the piece as a whole. The point made above also applies here: Moderators, do not always rate the sense of purpose of essays as highly as teachers who know what candidates are trying to prove. Finally, introduction and conclusion are not add-ons: they must be an integral part of the argument.

Report on the Units Taken in June 2005

As candidates have plenty of time and access to dictionaries and grammar books, there is no reason to apply grids 6B as if they had been working under exam conditions. Basic agreement and gender errors, when repeated must bring the accuracy mark down to the 'Poor' band and the same goes for incorrect verb endings. Attempts to use complex language that fails to communicate cannot be considered as 'Good'. The purpose of language is to communicate. To deserve a high mark for 'Range', the language has to be complex but it must also display a certain flair and fluency which goes beyond the use of the subjunctive or of a conditional clause.

The coursework option continues to prosper. It clearly brings much satisfaction and a sense of achievement to many candidates. Moderators continue to appreciate the depth of knowledge, the ability to reach thoughtful conclusions and the commitment of so many candidates.

**Advanced Subsidiary GCE French 3861
June 2005 Assessment Session**

Unit Threshold Marks

	<i>UNIT</i>	Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
2651 01/02/03	Raw mark	60	47	41	36	31	26	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2652	Raw mark	80	58	50	43	36	29	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2653	Raw mark	60	48	43	38	33	29	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0

Overall threshold marks in UMS (i.e. after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
3861	300	240	210	180	150	120	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
3861	24.85	42.81	62.15	78.91	91.45	100.00	3568

**Advanced GCE French 7861
June 2005 Assessment Session**

Unit Threshold Marks

	UNIT	Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
2654 01 / 03	Raw	60	48	43	38	33	29	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2655	Raw	80	59	53	47	41	35	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2656	Raw	60	46	41	36	31	26	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2657	Raw	60	50	45	40	35	30	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0

Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (i.e. after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
7861	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
7861	34.2	64.54	82.70	93.09	98.74	100.00	2345

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Information Bureau

(General Qualifications)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: helpdesk@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2005



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

