



Pearson

# Examiner's Report Principal Examiner Feedback

## Summer 2018

Pearson Edexcel GCE  
In Italian (8IN0) Paper 02

edexcel 

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2018

Publications Code 8IN0\_02\_1806\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

This paper is made up of three sections.

Section A is the Translation. Candidates are required to translate a text of approximately 70 words from English into Italian. This task is marked using a points-based mark scheme in which 1 mark is given for each correct individual section of language. Up to 20 marks are awarded for this section. All candidates must answer Section A.

Section B is the Written response to a literary text and Section C is the Written response to a film. At AS level there are 4 prescribed texts and 3 prescribed films with a choice of two questions for each work. Candidates are required to write one piece of 275-300 words in Italian choosing ONE question from section B or from Section C. The word count is not prescriptive. They are rewarded for their ability to respond critically to the aspect of the literary work or film outlined in the question. To provide a critical response, students should present and justify points of view, develop arguments and draw conclusions based on understanding. Up to 20 points are awarded for Critical Response. Up to 20 marks are awarded for Accuracy and range of grammatical structures and vocabulary, which assesses students' ability to use a range of grammatical structures and vocabulary accurately in order to produce articulate written communication with a range of expression.

### **Question 1**

This task is assessed according to a points-based mark scheme in which a mark is given for each correct individual section of language. The translation text is divided into 20 assessable items. A correct translation is provided in a grid that also outlines the alternative translations that will be accepted or the translations to be rejected.

Non-grammatical accent errors are tolerated, for example "fà"; however, "puo" would be rejected as the accent is part of the verb conjugation. Non-grammatical misspellings are tolerated, for example "avocato" rather than *avvocato*, as long as they are not ambiguous or in the wrong language or constitute a different word. Verb endings and adjective endings must be correct and will not be classed as spelling errors.

This year, in the first sentence a fair number of candidates left the accent of *è* and this changes the meaning so negates the point. Most knew *avvocato* although it was often misspelt.

*Un anno fa* was generally correct although some candidates used an apostrophe after the article, thus losing a point, and some put an accent on *fa* (which was still acceptable).

Most candidates were able to accurately conjugate *si è sposato* and this was encouraging. Some successfully used the *passato remoto* instead here and the use of the future in *avranno* was generally sound.

Candidates who used *ma* for 'but' were usually more successful than those who attempted to use *però* as many left the accent off and lost the point as the meaning was changed.

Almost all candidates were able to successfully render 'every week'. A fair number of candidates confused *porta* and *prende* for 'takes' and many also left out the word *ancora*, thereby failing to communicate all of the required information.

Candidates generally knew how to say *vestiti sporchi* although some misspelt the adjective ("*sporci*") and others put it in front of the noun but this was acceptable as long as the adjective ended correctly in -i.

Many used the indirect object pronoun *le* or the emphatic *lei (con lei)* correctly although there was some confusion at times with candidates using *ci* and *si*.

Most candidates managed to communicate 'this may seem funny', with a variety of expressions, and most seemed to know *può* but unfortunately a significant number left off the accent, thus losing a point. 'Serious consequences' was generally communicated effectively although many wrote '*conseguenze*' rather than *conseguenze* and '*seriose*' rather than *serie*.

The majority of candidates knew that *studio* was 'study' although some used the article incorrectly (thus losing a point).

*In Italia che* was successfully rendered by practically all candidates and *il controllo che* was generally successful. Candidates generally used the articulated preposition *sui* correctly although some misspelt it as two separate words and some used *sopra* for 'on' and these were not acceptable.

While many candidates used *danneggia* or *rovina* for 'damages', many could not express 'career prospects' effectively. Candidates that stuck to the straightforward *la loro carriera* were usually more successful.

Candidates generally showed some knowledge of grammatical principles and vocabulary but there were many instances of inconsistency. Many candidates could do with reading the text more carefully, sticking to the order of the text and checking their work carefully for omissions. A greater attention to detail in spelling (double letters and especially accents which could cost them marks) would also be advisable. It is also not particularly advisable to interpret rather than translate.

## **SECTION B – Literary texts**

### **Question 2 (a) – *Io non ho paura***

This was most popular choice for question 2 and overall in the whole paper. Most candidates showed knowledge of the book and key aspects of the friendship between Michele and Filippo. Better candidates discussed the development of the friendship from when Michele discovers Filippo and is initially afraid to how he overcomes his fears and how a bond then develops between the two boys. They discussed the friendship in terms of its importance for both boys and its wider significance within the story. Weaker responses were too descriptive with some candidates simply giving a summary of the plot.

### **Question 2 (b) – *Io non ho paura***

This was also a fairly popular choice. Again, candidates showed knowledge of the novel and knew key events in terms of Michele's loss of innocence. These included the discovery of the hole, Michele's realisation of the adults' involvement in the kidnapping, Salvatore's betrayal and the final scenes of the novel. Better candidates explained how this led to Michele's loss of innocence and the impact that this had on him. Again, weaker candidates simply described the plot with little critical response in relation to the question.

### **Question 3 (a) – *Volevo i pantaloni***

Surprisingly, not many candidates opted for this question, despite being a fairly popular choice in the older syllabus. Most responses were very descriptive: candidates did mention aspects of Angelina's role such as that of puttana and the fact that she was from the north and had a different outlook but they did not manage to explain the significance of her role within the novel. One response was quite inaccurate and the candidate did not even seem to know the book very well.

### **Question 3 (b) – *Volevo i pantaloni***

Candidates were generally able to explain the different episodes in Annetta's life, such as the desire to wear trousers, be a nun, be a man and then a puttana. Again, answers were very descriptive and candidates were generally not successful in describing the importance of these events and how Annetta consequently evolves as a character.

### **Question 4 (a) – *Marcovaldo***

This question elicited a few responses despite being a prescriptive text new to the AS syllabus. Most candidates were able to mention some aspects of how social injustice is presented in the novel, e.g. the poverty of Marcovaldo's family versus the rampant consumerism in society. Candidates did show some knowledge of the stories and in particular of Marcovaldo al supermarket. Some of the responses lost focus, however, as candidates tried too hard to contextualise the novel and ended up discussing (in too much detail) the socio-economic situation of Italy at the time, which was only partly relevant to the question.

### **Question 4 (b) – *Marcovaldo***

The few responses to this question were generally rather superficial. Candidates were not focused on the question so they did not draw valid conclusions in relation to the question set. The better ones discussed how Marcovaldo is presented in a humorous way through his actions and through the language that is used. They also discussed the extent to which the humorous elements are present in the work, mentioning that the outcomes of the stories can be humorous although they can be somewhat ironic and therefore the humour is tainted with pathos at times.

### **Question 5 (a)/(b) – *Senza sangue***

Despite this text being a fairly popular choice in the previous syllabus, there was only one response to question 5(b) this year, which failed to explain the role of Tito and his influence on Nina's life and in fact demonstrated very limited knowledge of the text itself.

## **SECTION C – Film**

### **Question 6 (a) – *Nuovo Cinema Paradiso***

This film was the second most popular choice for candidates this year, eliciting almost as many responses as question 2(a). There were some very good responses, with candidates generally showing good knowledge of the film as well as an ability to produce a critical response to the question. In terms of Alfredo's role, most candidates discussed his relationship with Salvatore and how he became a father figure for him, discussing the impact of Alfredo's guidance and foresight on Salvatore's life at various points. Some also mentioned the role he played within

the wider community as the projectionist at the cinema and his central role in village life. There were fewer overly-descriptive responses here than in other questions.

### **Question 6 (b) – *Nuovo Cinema Paradiso***

Not many candidates opted for this question as the vast majority who studied *Nuovo Cinema Paradiso* chose question 6(a). The few responses to question 6(b) were rather varied in standards, with some being quite descriptive while the better ones examined the changes in the village and the implications of these changes.

### **Question 7 (a) – *Va' dove ti porta il cuore***

This film also produced a surprisingly high number of responses given that it is a prescriptive film new to the AS syllabus. Candidates who opted for this question tended to produce descriptive answers and lost focus on what the question was asking. Some did mention how the lack of communication between Olga and Ilaria, and later Marta, reveals a lack of understanding between the generations but answers were not well-developed.

### **Question 7 (b) – *Va' dove ti porta il cuore***

Candidates generally had a good knowledge of the film but their understanding of what the question was asking was often limited. Some produced answers which were merely a summary of the plot while others discussed key events but did not explain their relevance to the title. There were, however, some very good responses in which candidates discussed how Olga had not been able to follow her heart due to the pressures of the society she lived in and this had led to negative consequences that would follow her through life. They discussed how the letter-diary reveals that not being able to follow her heart (instead having to conform to societal expectations) had caused much upset for Olga and therefore that the letter-diary could be viewed as a message to Marta about the importance of following your heart in life in order to find happiness. These answers were well-linked and all points were relevant and related to the title. There were also some instances of very long responses, particularly for this film: while the word count is not prescriptive candidates are reminded that overlong essays often lose focus at times despite being critical.

### **Question 8 (a) – *Il postino***

Most candidates were able to describe Beatrice accurately as an attractive and wilful woman but some essays were a bit superficial in the way they examined her role within the film and her influence on Mario.

### **Question 8 (b) – *Il postino***

This was the third most popular question of all the questions and there were a range of answers in terms of quality of response. Candidates knew the film well and were able to describe how Mario's passion for poetry develops from meeting Pablo Neruda, to wooing Beatrice and his involvement in politics. Better candidates mentioned the impact of this passion for Mario in terms of how it helped him to become better educated and more inquisitive and also how it ultimately leads to his death. Some candidates produced unbalanced responses where their discussion of Neruda's influence was disproportionate for the question being asked. Better candidates were able to maintain a focus on Mario's passion for poetry and the impact of this for him.

Overall, responses were quite varied in standards. While some candidates were able to produce produced critical responses with relevant points supported by appropriate evidence from the work many were rather superficial. Most candidates generally seemed to have a reasonable knowledge of the book/film but many produced responses that were overly descriptive and/or that lost focus on the question. Better candidates substantiated points and made valid arguments in relation to the question set.

The quality of the language was also quite varied, ranging from fairly limited/simple vocabulary and structures to very accurate and complex.

As a final point, candidates are reminded that they only need to answer ONE question either from Section B or Section C: there were a few instances of candidates who wrote short responses for each text/film.

Candidates are also reminded that although the word count is not prescriptive overlong essays often lose focus so they should plan their essays carefully.

Candidates are also reminded of the importance of "clear and orderly presentation": they really need to consider that work which is illegible cannot gain marks.

