
ITALIAN (PRINCIPAL)

9783/03

Paper 3 Writing and Usage

For Examination from 2016

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

2 hours 15 minutes

MAXIMUM MARK: 60

The syllabus is approved for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

This document consists of **5** printed pages and **1** blank page.

Part I: Writing (40 marks)**1 Discursive Essay**

- **Accuracy and linguistic range (24 marks) [AO2]**
- **Development and organisation of ideas (16 marks) [AO3]**

Accuracy and linguistic range

22–24	<i>Excellent</i>	Almost flawless. Excellent range of vocabulary and complex sentence patterns. Good sense of idiom.
18–21	<i>Very good</i>	Highly accurate. Wide range of vocabulary and complex sentence patterns. Some sense of idiom.
14–17	<i>Good</i>	Generally accurate. Good range of vocabulary and some complex sentence patterns.
10–13	<i>Satisfactory</i>	Predominantly simple patterns correctly used and/or some complex language attempted, but with variable success. Adequate range of vocabulary, but some repetition.
6–9	<i>Weak</i>	Persistent errors may impede communication. Simple and repetitive sentence patterns. Limited vocabulary.
1–5	<i>Poor</i>	Little evidence of grammatical awareness. Inaccuracy often impedes communication. Very limited vocabulary.
0		No relevant material presented.

Development and organisation of ideas

15–16	<i>Excellent</i>	Implications of question fully grasped. Ideas and arguments very effectively organised, illustrated with relevant examples. Wholly convincing.
12–14	<i>Very good</i>	Most implications of question explored. Ideas and arguments well organised, illustrated with relevant examples. Coherent argument.
9–11	<i>Good</i>	Main implications of question explored. Organisation generally clear but lacking coherence in places. Some relevant examples. Some ability to develop argument.
6–8	<i>Satisfactory</i>	Some implications of question explored. Patchy or unambitious organisation, but with some attempt at illustration. Some irrelevant material.
3–5	<i>Weak</i>	Limited understanding of question. A few relevant points made. Rambling and/or repetitive. Ideas and arguments poorly developed.
1–2	<i>Poor</i>	Minimal response. Implications of question only vaguely grasped. Very limited relevant content. Disorganised, unsubstantiated and undeveloped.
0		No relevant material presented.

Indicative Content

Candidates are free to interpret the question in any way they wish. The following notes are not intended to be prescriptive but to give an indication of some of the points which could be made in response to the question; they are by no means exhaustive.

(a) Secondo te, la globalizzazione ha più aspetti positivi che negativi? Giustifica la tua risposta.

Candidates are asked to assess whether globalisation has more positive or negative effects. They might usefully begin by attempting to explain what they understand by the term. A wide range of responses is possible here: they may point to economic benefits either for the ‘globalised’ countries or the ‘globalising’ ones; they may discuss the cultural impact of globalisation, and may see this as positive or negative (or both). Either way, they should provide some relevant examples and any conclusions should be coherently explained and fully justified.

(b) ‘La madre che rimane a casa dopo la nascita dei figli, invece di ritornare al lavoro, tira su sempre bambini più sani e più felici’. Sei d’accordo o no?

Candidates are asked to decide whether they agree with the statement that the children of stay-at-home mothers grow up healthier and happier than those whose mothers return to work. This is an issue on which there is quite a divergence of opinion, and this may be reflected in the candidates’ answers. The best answers will consider both sides of the argument, weighing up the perceived benefits for mothers of staying at home – e.g. stronger bonds with children, involvement in all aspects of children’s life, freedom from feelings of guilt etc. – against those of returning to work – greater financial security, greater variety and intellectual stimulation, etc. All conclusions should be fully justified.

(c) Secondo te, è giusto che un calciatore guadagni più di un medico? Perché (no)?

Candidates are asked to assess whether or not it is fair that footballers earn more than doctors. Again, they would be well advised to try and weigh up the justifications that might exist on both sides, and although many will probably conclude that the doctor’s work is ‘worth’ more than that of the footballer (e.g. more socially useful, requires many years of study, etc.), any well-justified arguments in favour of the footballer should be rewarded equally generously.

(d) ‘La televisione aiuta lo sviluppo intellettuale’. Sei d’accordo o no?

Candidates are asked whether they agree with the statement that television helps intellectual development. They are likely to focus on children and young people, but are not specifically required to do so by the question. There are two ways of seeing this issue: those who agree with the title statement might point to ways in which television broadens people’s cultural awareness or mention the high-quality and research-based programming aimed at younger children these days. Those who take the opposite view might argue that television encourages passivity and therefore impedes intellectual development. The best answers will focus on the specific slant of the question and offer a well-justified conclusion.

(e) Perché, secondo te, gli esseri umani non sembrano imparare mai niente dalla storia?

Candidates are asked to explain why they think people never seem to learn anything from history. There are many ways of tackling this more open and philosophical question, but candidates will need to choose suitable examples to support their theories. There is also scope here for candidates to take issue with the question and demonstrate that the opposite can be true.

Part II: Usage (20 marks)

Esercizio 1

Q. Nr.	Accept	Mark	Reject
2	dessi	[1]	
3	avrebbe chiamato (aveva chiamato)	[1]	
4	possa (potrò)	[1]	
5	ha acceso	[1]	
6	muoiono (stanno morendo)	[1]	

[Total: 5]
[AO2]

Esercizio 2

Q. Nr.	Accept	Mark	Reject
7	Mamma <u>me le ha date</u> stamattina	[1]	
8	È difficile <u>capire le sue opinioni</u>	[1]	
9	Franco ha detto che <u>non gli (a lui non) piacevano / piacciono</u> i giornali italiani	[1]	
10	Benché <u>sapessi la verità</u> , non ho detto niente	[1]	
11	Siamo arrivati alla stazione dopo <u>la partenza del treno / che il treno era partito</u>	[1]	

[Total: 5]
[AO2]

Esercizio 3 (One tick for each, then see conversion table below.)

Question number	Correct option	Correct response
12	B	proteggere
13	A	inappropriati
14	C	che
15	B	ci siano
16	D	al quale
17	A	potranno
18	B	propri
19	C	da
20	A	ricevono
21	B	ai
22	D	essendo
23	D	di
24	A	grandi
25	B	crescita
26	A	migliore
27	A	il
28	D	a
29	B	vogliono
30	C	ci
31	A	tutti

Conversion table:

Number of ticks	Mark
19–20	10
17–18	9
15–16	8
13–14	7
11–12	6
9–10	5
7–8	4
5–6	3
3–4	2
1–2	1
0	0

**[Total: 10]
[AO2]**

