

Examiners' Report/
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2015

Pearson Edexcel GCSE
in French (5FR01/1H)
Paper 1H: Listening and
Understanding in French

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

Summer 2015

Publications Code UG041529*

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

GCSE French

Unit 1: Listening and Understanding in French Examiners' Report

Paper 1F Higher Tier

Candidates performed well across the paper as a whole and there were some excellent performances. The questions that were intended to discriminate did so, but the majority of candidates understood enough, and felt confident enough, to attempt the whole paper and there were very few blank answers, even on Q4 requiring answers in English. There was evidence of some good listening and exam skills. Many candidates had used the five minutes reading time well (underlining key words in the title, rubric and questions, annotating questions) generally using the time to anticipate what they were about to hear. The performance of weaker candidates was characterised by lack of vocabulary, lack of attention to detail, poor reading of the questions, "snatched" listening based on the identification of single words rather than listening to the extract as a whole, mishearing and imagination. There were some candidates who were unable to cope with the demands of the Higher paper, and for whom the experience must have been demoralising. These candidates would have possibly benefited from taking the Foundation rather than the Higher paper or from having greater practice of the various test types particularly those used for questions targeted at grade B and above.

The performance on the overlap questions (Q1, Q2, Q5 and Q6) was generally better than at Foundation level. However, the performance of weaker candidates was similar to that of Foundation level candidates on these questions (see Foundation level report) with the same questions and question parts proving harder for weaker candidates.

The questions that were intended to discriminate did so and weaker candidates found the questions targeted at grades B and above challenging.

Q3 and Q7 discriminated well. In Q3 lack of vocabulary and not listening to the whole cost candidates marks. Parts (i) and (ii) proved more accessible but parts (iii) and (iv) proved more challenging, e.g. in part (iv) some candidates failed to distinguish A as the correct answer from, *'Mon père m'encourage à regarder plus de documentaires mais ça ne m'intéresse pas trop. Par contre j'ai l'intention de regarder plus de jeux, eux aussi, ils sont éducatifs'*. The most common incorrect answer was obviously B (*documentaries*) but answer E was also common (*detective series*). Q7, which involved some paraphrasing, proved hard for weaker candidates. Parts (iii) and (iv) were more accessible with parts (i) and (ii) the least accessible. In part (i) many candidates failed to match, *'ça manque d'ambiance mais je n'ai pas beaucoup d'argent donc j'y vais souvent'*, with answer A *the price*. Candidates should be able to at this level to match, *'je n'ai pas beaucoup d'argent donc j'y vais souvent'* with the price.

Q8 was challenging with understandably only the best candidates scoring well. In part A candidates had to listen carefully to distinguish between correct and incorrect statements and identify the speaker. It should be noted that in this type of exercise only one person will express the statement given. Many candidates gave H as an answer for both Roselyne and Christian. Part B also required close listening and an understanding of the whole, again weaker candidates tended to tick the answer containing the first word they recognised and understood. Again candidates lose marks through lack of attention to detail such as negation, qualifiers, tenses and precise understanding of vocabulary.

As always the open-ended questions requiring answers in English were a good discriminator (Q4). There were some excellent performances from better candidates on these questions but they proved difficult for weaker candidates. Candidates' responses indicated they had understood the gist of the extract although lack of attention to detail cost weaker candidates marks. Only the better candidates were able to supply the detail and accuracy required at this level. Some candidates failed to recognise familiar vocabulary in an unfamiliar context. Weaker candidates tended to answer using their experience rather than what was heard, for example, there were many references in part (b) to *the school will get better results/ the students will get better results/they will be able to do more work* although none of these are mentioned at all. In part (e) there were answers such as *poor teaching/are holidays too long/ school work/behaviour/exams/the school day*, which bore no relation to what was heard.

There were quite a lot of instances of candidates adding information that wasn't in the extract e.g. in part (b) a upon hearing, *'ces grandes vacances sont difficiles pour les parents qui travaillent'*, some candidates gave answers such as *it's difficult for parents to get time off work/ it is hard to get child care*. For *les enfants s'ennuient* there were answers such as *children get bored because where they live there is nothing for them to do*. Answers which contain information which is not mentioned are not credited. In some instances candidates took separate pieces of information and linked them together in a way which implied causation eg in part (f), *'certains profs ne respecteraient pas les élèves, la pression des examens sans parler des disputes à la maison à cause des notes ou du travail scolaire'*, common incorrect answers were *arguments at home cause them to have bad grades/ cause them to do badly at school, exam pressure causes arguments at home, teachers argue with the pupils, arguments with other pupils* even answers such as *examiners don't respect them*, (misunderstanding of *examens*).

Some answers were too vague, for example, in part (a) *'ils (les enfants) oublient tout ce qu'ils ont appris'*, many candidates wrote *children forget things/they forget most of what they have learnt*. In part (d) *'ils n'auraient pas à travailler le soir chez eux'*, gave rise to answers such as *they will have more time in the evening* with no reference to not having to do any school work. Also in this part

of the question there were incorrect vague answers such as *they will have less homework* (rather than no homework). This lack of attention to detail loses marks as does not expressing the answers clearly and unambiguously.

The accurate understanding of key basic items of vocabulary and structures is also important, and weaker candidates do not have this, see the references to *examens* above. *La journée* mentioned in part (b) was understood as *journey* and there were lots of references to the journey to school will be longer. Some candidates believing that the extract was about the journey to school developed this theme across several answers eg in part (e), *what students thought of the journey to school*. To do well at this level candidates should be aware of common faux amis like *la journée*. Rather surprisingly at this level there were a number of candidates who failed to accurately render common items of vocabulary eg in part (a) using *infants* to mean children (from *enfants*), in part (f) rendered *les professeurs* as the professors. Also in part (f) *les notes* was rendered as *notes/messages* with answers such as *notes from school cause arguments at home*.

Some answers were illogical e.g. in part (d) *do homework in school during the holidays/ have more non pupil days/ have more educational days*, in part (d) *travel to school in the evenings*. Again this illustrates, homing in on single items of vocabulary and building answers around the recognition of a single word.

On the whole the performance of the better candidates on the paper was characterised by:

- careful reading of the rubric
- listening to the whole rather than honing in on individual items of vocabulary
- recognising the use of negation
- attention to detail, giving full rather than partial answers
- good knowledge of vocabulary
- expressing themselves clearly and unambiguously when writing in English and relating their answers to facts in the extract
- applying logic
- reading over and correcting their answers

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

