

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2010 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

9782 PRINCIPAL COURSE RUSSIAN

9782/01

Paper 1 (Speaking), maximum raw mark 60

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- CIE will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2010 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9782	01

A: Discussion of a newspaper article and related topics (30 marks)

- Comprehension and Discussion (14 marks)
- Range and Accuracy (10 marks)
- Pronunciation and intonation (6 marks)

Comprehension and Discussion (14 marks)	Range and Accuracy (10 marks)	Pronunciation and intonation (6 marks)
13–14 <i>Excellent</i> Excellent understanding of article and response to examiner's prompts. Shows initiative in developing discussion.	9–10 <i>Excellent</i> Excellent level of accuracy. Confident and effective use of wide range of structures.	6 <i>Excellent</i> Authentic pronunciation and intonation.
11–12 <i>Very good</i> Very good understanding of article and response to examiner's prompts. Responds readily without undue hesitation.	7–8 <i>Very Good</i> Very good level of accuracy, over range of structures. Tenses and agreements generally reliable, but some lapses in more complex areas.	5 <i>Very good</i> Very good pronunciation and intonation.
9–10 <i>Good</i> Good understanding of article and response to examiner's prompts. Reasonably forthcoming but tends to follow examiner's lead.	5–6 <i>Good</i> Good level of accuracy, with some inconsistency. Some complex language attempted. Errors do not impair communication.	4 <i>Good</i> Generally good pronunciation and intonation.
7–8 <i>Satisfactory</i> Adequate understanding of article and response to most of examiner's prompts. Has difficulty with more complicated ideas.	3–4 <i>Satisfactory</i> Gaps in knowledge of grammar. Communication impaired by errors.	3 <i>Satisfactory</i> Satisfactory pronunciation and intonation.
4–6 <i>Weak</i> Limited understanding of article and very limited responses, with marked hesitation.	1–2 <i>Weak</i> Little evidence of grammatical awareness. Accuracy only in simple forms.	2 <i>Weak</i> Many sounds mispronounced.
1–3 <i>Poor</i> Minimal understanding of article and response to examiner's prompts.		1 <i>Poor</i> Native language heavily influences pronunciation and intonation, impeding communication.
0 No significant understanding of article and response to examiner's prompts.		0 Wholly inauthentic pronunciation and intonation.

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9782	01

B: Prepared topic discussion (30 marks)

- Factual knowledge and opinions (14 marks)
- Range and Accuracy (10 marks)
- Pronunciation and intonation (6 marks)

Factual knowledge and opinions (14 marks)	Range and Accuracy (10 marks)	Pronunciation and intonation (6 marks)
13–14 Excellent Excellent factual knowledge of subject, understanding, illustration and opinion. Excellent preparation and discussion.	9–10 Excellent Excellent level of accuracy. Confident and effective use of wide range of structures.	6 Excellent Authentic pronunciation and intonation.
11–12 Very good Comprehensive knowledge of the subject, demonstrating clear understanding and using appropriate illustration. Range of relevant opinion, confidently discussed.	7–8 Very Good Very good level of accuracy, over range of structures. Tenses and agreements generally reliable, but some lapses in more complex areas.	5 Very good Very good pronunciation and intonation.
9–10 Good A good range of knowledge, generally well used. Relevant opinions. Ideas discussed well.	5–6 Good Good level of accuracy, with some inconsistency. Some complex language attempted. Errors do not impair communication.	4 Good Generally good pronunciation and intonation.
7–8 Satisfactory Solid base of knowledge, but insecure in some areas. Opinion adequate. Not always able to develop discussion.	3–4 Satisfactory Gaps in knowledge of grammar. Communication impaired by errors.	3 Satisfactory Satisfactory pronunciation and intonation.
4–6 Weak Limited knowledge, with obvious gaps. Some irrelevance and repetition. Opinions limited. Discussion pedestrian and/or hesitant.	1–2 Weak Little evidence of grammatical awareness. Accuracy only in simple forms.	2 Weak Many sounds mispronounced.
1–3 Poor Very limited knowledge. Material very thin and vague. Very hesitant discussion.		1 Poor Native language heavily influences pronunciation and intonation, impeding communication.
0 No knowledge shown of topic.		0 Wholly inauthentic pronunciation and intonation.