GCSE

This Examiners' Report relates to mark scheme
Publication Code: UG 015428

edexcel ▪▪▪

GCSE
French (3226)

Summer 2004

edexcel ▪▪▪

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information please call our Customer Response Centre on 0870 240 9800, or visit our website at www.edexcel.org.uk.

CONTENTS

Paper 1F – Listening and Responding

There were some good performances with some candidates scoring well across the paper as a whole. However there were a lot of candidates who found elements of the paper daunting, particularly questions requiring note-taking in French and answers in English.

The questions requiring the recognition of single lexical items (Q1-10) proved accessible to the majority of candidates. Vocabulary in these questions seemed to be well known and Q1-5 were particularly well answered. Some items caused problems. In Q4 some candidates did not recognise *je travaille dans un magasin* and in Q7 *à gauche* was not known by many.

The questions that were intended to discriminate did so and many candidates found the overlap questions targeted at grades D and C daunting (Q11, Q12). Whilst most candidates attempted Q12 weaker candidates left either parts or the whole of Q11 blank. Better candidates were generally well practised in note taking in the target language for Q11 but there are still some candidates who do not recognise basic vocabulary and question words such as *jour?* and *où?* in parts (a) and (b). Quite a lot of candidates gave *génial* for one or both of these questions (taken from *ça va être génial* in the extract) or *Jean-Lou* taken from the rubric. Whilst many candidates recognised *jeudi* as the correct day of the week, every day of the week was given by various candidates on a random basis. There are still a large number of candidates who are unable to spell the days of the week correctly. In (b) *gare* was recognised by the majority of candidates but again some candidates were unable to write it in an acceptably recognisable form. Unfortunately recognition of *gare* in part (b) did lead many candidates to write *train* in answer to part (d) although the word *train* was not mentioned in the extract, this did highlight a common problem of candidates not listening to the whole of the extract. Part (c) was correctly answered by many candidates but some candidates failed to hear the *neuf* in *dix-neuf* and incorrectly gave *10h30* as an answer; some candidates recognised the numbers but were unable to write the time in a recognisable form; *19 à 30* (*à* presumably a mishearing of *heures*) was common. There are still candidates who transcribe the time in writing and then convert it into incorrect figures. In part (d) apart from *train,* incorrect answers included *gare* and car (most probably a mishearing of *gare* rather than a translation of the correct answer *voiture)*. In part (e) there was the usual confusion of *2, 10, 12* and even *20*, although many candidates did give the correct answer *12.* In this question many candidates lost marks through their inability to express themselves unambiguously in the written form. Whilst marks are awarded for communication and candidates did score marks with incorrect spellings, it should be noted that poor spelling can lead to information not being communicated, particularly where inaccurate spelling creates a new word.

Q12 required the identification of opinions, a skill required at grade C and this continues to challenge candidates at this level and the question proved difficult for all but the best candidates. Candidates need to be trained to cope with paraphrasing and to listen for clues in the extract to help them select the correct answer, e.g. in (i) *n'a pas cours/ malade* for answer E *absent(e),* (ii) *ne se fâche jamais/ très calme* for G, *patient(e)* (v) *rire* for answer C *amusant(e).*

Candidates generally found the questions requiring answers in English accessible (Q13-14) and there were fewer blanks. However, these questions continue to be a good discriminator and many candidates found them difficult despite the fact that basic vocabulary was tested. Many candidates at this level fail to listen to the extract as a whole but hone in on individual items of vocabulary and construct answers around individual words eg in Q13(b) candidates heard *tous les jours* and *samedi* and put them together to give the incorrect answer *everyday except Saturday*, likewise in (c) they heard the words *collège* and *musique* and then constructed answers such as *he went to school and had music.*

Many did recognise *guitare* in part Q13(a) but *facile* in Q14 (a) was not well recognised, some candidates heard *difficile*, many thought incorrectly that it meant *fun* or *fascinating*. There was quite a lot of evidence this year to suggest that candidates are now confusing English and French words; in the past mistakes where candidates confused French words were common e.g. *facile* and *difficile* as above; this year many candidates were thinking in English and when they heard the word *cher* invented answers such as *he has to share it* which was very common or *he needs to sit on a chair* which was also very common. In a similar vain *tous les jours* in part (b) for many became *2 times a day*.

There were many answers which were poor invention such as *he records his music for* Q13(c), *the strings break* for Q14(b).

Many examiners commented on the candidates' poor expression in English and their inability to express basic answers in an unambiguous way, many answer with one word only which is often not enough detail to answer the question. Poor spelling of basic English is also a problem; many candidates were unable to spell the word guitar and answers such as Q14(b) *he has a saw hand* were common.

The admin of many centres was excellent but there were centres who failed to complete and/or return both the Foundation or Higher register. This is essential otherwise it is hard for examiners to know if a candidate who was marked absent for the Foundation Paper, was absent for the whole exam or took the Higher Paper.

There were fewer rubric infringements such as ticking too many boxes or writing in the wrong language, both of which are penalised. There are unfortunately still candidates who answer in pencil and also candidates who wrote in a variety of different colours, centres should instruct candidates to answer in preferably black ink.

Paper 1H - Listening and Responding

There were only a small number of candidates who took the paper this year and this makes generalisations difficult. Whilst there were some very good performances with candidates scoring well across the paper as a whole, quite a few candidates found the paper very demanding and would perhaps have benefited more from taking the Foundation Level paper.

The performance on the overlap questions targeted at grades D and C (Q1 and Q4) was better from good candidates but the performance of many was similar to Foundation Level candidates.

Q2 proved challenging for some candidates, parts (d) and (e) were the most accessible but in parts (a) – (c) candidates either failed to understand the choices in the rubric or failed to recognise vocabulary which linked to the answers e.g in (a) *températures, doux, saison* to link with answer A *la météo*, in part (b) *reportage/ grève* to link with answer C *les informations* and in part (c) *grande finale*, *questions, prix, un million d'euros* to link with answer G *un jeu télévisé*.

Q3 also proved difficult. This was a demanding question which required the ability to understand paraphrasing and in some instances to distinguish between tenses and to recognise the implication of the negative in expressions such as: *je n'ai jamais fume, je fume depuis 10 ans, avant je fumais mais maintenant je ne fume plus,* also the ability to understand comparisons: *je suis paresseux, je fais un peu de sport de temps en temps je suis membre d'une équipe…trois fois par semaine*.

The questions requiring answers in English (Q5 and Q6) were a good discriminator. Whilst many candidates were able to follow the gist of the extract only the better candidates were able to supply the detail required at this level.

Q5(a) and (b) were the most accessible with many candidates scoring one or two marks although there were some illogical answers to Q5b such as *9 out of 10 French people are not French, speak/do not speak French.*

Whilst many candidates understood parts of Q6, many failed to gain marks through incomplete answers. Many candidates heard fast-food in the extract and then proceeded to construct all their answers to Q6 around fast food eg in part (a) *they eat 70 kilos of fast food* in (c) *they eat fast food whilst watching TV /on the computer*.

In Q6(a) disappointingly some candidates seemed not to know or recognise *pain,* many rendered *70* as *60* and only better candidates picked up the *par an* and understood it. Again many candidates fail to read what they have written and answers such *as eat 70 kilos of bread per day* were common. Again in Q6(b) many candidates failed to listen to the whole and honed in on individual words like *fast-food* or *hamburgers,* the wording in the extract was very straightforward *ils n'aiment pas les hamburgers* but again many candidates are unable to express precisely what they heard and loose translation cost candidates marks with answers such as *don't eat hamburgers* – which is in fact contrary to what was indicated by the *malgré le succès des fast- foods*. Disappointingly in 6(c) *3 heures* was misunderstood by some candidates and *2 hours* was a common incorrect answer, many candidates gave partial answers eg *watch TV for 3 hours*- omitting to mention time spent on the computer. Many candidates failed to read the rubric which said, *Every day young French people*… and went on to write answers such as *watch 3 hours of TV or spent 3 hours on the computer per week or per month*.

The performance of all but the better candidates on the questions in English is characterised by:

- failure to read the rubric
- snatched listening of individual items of vocabulary
- lack of attention to detail, partial answers
- loose expression in English which does not convey the intended message
- unambiguously and does not relate to concrete detail in the extract
- failure to apply logic
- failure to read over what has been written

There were fewer rubric infringements such as ticking too many boxes or writing in the wrong language, both of which are penalised. There are unfortunately still candidates who answer in pencil and also candidates who wrote in a variety of different colours, centres should instruct candidates to answer in preferably black ink.

Papers 2F/H – Speaking

Candidates built on previous years' performances in the oral test and clearly used classroom practice to perform across most aspects of the examination. There was an even performance across the majority of role-plays and the conversation section although examiners report fewer candidates reaching the highest mark bands in the both the role plays and the conversation.

Role play A

This generally provided a secure basis for marks and offered encouragement to most candidates to attempt the B role play. However there were significantly fewer candidates who scored full marks in this element of the examination and weaker candidates again found this element more demanding than in previous series.

It is evident that candidates are more aware of items of food and drink, clothes and classroom objects but many were unable to score well in less familiar situations in this role-play. All situations are well covered in textbooks and are taken from he minimum core vocabulary. Many found greater difficulty with items requested in A4, types of room were not widely known. A8, *horaire* was unknown. A10, *bouteille* was rarely heard, although bottle or *bouttle* was. *Caisse* continues to be a problem for many candidates, most commonly pronounced as *casse* or *cassé,* neither of which could be credited.

Learning of the minimum core vocabulary is essential for these common items that are in everyday use in survival situations and Teacher-examiners should be aware that a variety of vocabulary are used over the twelve role plays, particularly in the new specification with the wider range of situations.

There remains confusion where a candidate combined two responses. It is not necessary for teacher examiners to ask again for a quantity, colour or size. Teacher-examiners are reminded that responses may be combined without penalty.

Role play B

The majority of candidates were able to experience some success in role play B although there was an increase in the numbers of candidates scoring zero. The role plays challenged Foundation Level candidates and provided Higher level candidates with an accessible beginning to their speaking examination. Candidates should be advised that only rarely will one word utterances be possible to satisfy the demands of the B role play.
Marks are lost if the required message is only partially completed. Candidates should check that they communicate all of the message indicated by the words and pictures on their card.

Many candidates successfully answered the unpredictable questions. However *Combien de temps …?*, *Qu'est-ce que ….. ?* and *Comment ……?* were poorly answered, even by a significant number of more able candidates at both levels, despite being answered correctly later during the conversation.
Teacher-examiners should not rephrase the unpredictable question in any way. When this happens, candidates cannot be credited for their answer, however appropriate it may be.

A significant number of candidates offered items of vocabulary other than those indicated in the role plays and centres are reminded that where there is oblique candidates must offer one of the items as part of the message required. This was particularly the case when candidates were offering information about a job or in B9 where candidates were required to say what hurts. Similarly, if more than one item is offered only the first will be marked, even if it is incorrect and the others correct.

Although many candidates score highly, particularly those at Higher Level, candidates should be aware that tense errors affect the communication of a task and that poor tense usage will reduce the marks gained. There was a considerable number of candidates at both levels who used infinitive or imperfect forms for the present tense of *er* verbs.

Most candidates were able to attempt the four tasks although for a significant number the framing of questions and common question words are difficult and such tasks are often not clearly communicated, particularly when attempting such tasks as *Ask if your penfriend has a job?* etc. *Qu'est-ce que tu fais le soir?* was particularly difficult for many candidates and few were able to master the use of obligation. However some more able candidates were able to get round this by alternative means. Task 4 continues to be a good discriminator within many of the role-plays.

In B2 *quai* proved problematic and in B8 neither *serviette* nor *brosse à dents* were widely known.

Role play C

This was much more successfully attempted this year and many examiners reported that teacher-examiners and candidates appeared more at ease with the more user-friendly format of the role-play. Candidates were able to engage more when they knew where the unpredictable questions were going to be asked.

However a significant number of centres do not encourage candidates to expand the role play and therefore prevent them from accessing the higher mark bands. There are opportunities within the bullet points, and one of the unpredictable questions is more open-ended, in order for candidates to expand and show what they are capable of. Centres must not though turn the role-play into a mini conversation of up to five minutes. This rarely benefits the candidate, as there is often much irrelevance which cannot be credited as expansion and often affects the communication of the points needed.

At the same time, simple reading of the bullet point or from the stimulus material will not score well. Expansion of a bullet point can be achieved quite simply by the use, for example, of a short phrase or by offering some extended description.

Centres are reminded that where there is a question mark within the tasks they are expected to ask a question. If a candidate produces a statement they are considered not to have conveyed the task successfully and often only the more able candidates were able to frame questions successfully.

There was still a significant minority of centres where the teacher-examiner's knowledge of the situation was less than adequate and consequently did not respond adequately to the candidate thus causing confusion. Where the teacher-examiner is able to respond naturally to the candidate's responses, whatever they may be, candidates generally were more at ease and therefore able to score more highly.

An increasing number of candidates failed to read the rubric at the top of the card rendering some of the responses irrelevant during the role play, so that although they seemed to say a lot they cannot score marks for these elements.

The bullet points were on the whole accurately completed although *Repas? Achats, Rendez-vous?* and *Où?* continue to cause problems for many candidates on all the occasions they are used.

The unpredictable questions continued to be a good discriminator and candidates were able on the whole to answer the more closed question.

Question words however are still a major problem for many candidates who either are not listening carefully or are unaware of the true meaning of them. *Comment?* was interpreted as *Combien?* with reference to money. *Vos details …* is still often very superficially dealt with, often producing just a forename. Details of a mobile telephone number and offering a passport were not seen as successfully completing the task nor were descriptions of the person or their family.

Situations dealing with jobs continue to be difficult for weaker candidates at this level, often because candidates did not appear to have prepared thoroughly or had not read the English introduction to the situation.

However there were many excellent role plays. Candidates responded well to teacher-examiners who used the prompts thoughtfully and where encouragement and careful responding to their replies enabled them to expand effectively.

Conversation

In many cases the conversation of the test is well structured and interesting to hear. However this year's examination was marked by a more than thorough preparation of the topic in many centres, where an increasing number asked an insufficient variety of questions throughout the centre, and there was a significant minority of centres who asked the same questions to all candidates. Invariably candidates, where this happens, are unable to score highly during this element.

Teacher-examiners are reminded that the specimen questions in the Handbook are merely suggestions. There were a large number of centres where the teacher-examiners only asked the candidates these questions. This penalised candidates who were unable to take the initiative and often only produced short responses. These questions are at times non-sequitur and therefore often confused candidates who were unable to follow the thread of the conversation. It is against the candidates' interests to follow them slavishly with no personalisation of the conversation. Teacher-examiners should use the responses of the candidate to stimulate the next question.
Naturally, the best conversations occurred when teacher-examiners listened to candidates' answers and progressed in a natural way rather than working through the questions in the handbook

The conversation is marked globally and in an increasing number of cases candidates who were able to speak well, in a variety of tenses during the pre-learnt, prepared section, were unable to offer responses to simple questions during the rest of the topic. These candidates could not be awarded high marks.

Timing continues to be a concern in a minority of centres and centres are reminded that candidates cannot gain credit for responses outside the time limits given in the rubric. Candidates should be given the opportunity to use appropriate structures and language within the time allotted for this part of the examination.
- 2-3 minutes Foundation Level conversation
- 4-5 minutes Higher Level conversation

Similarly short conversations will prevent the candidates from demonstrating their ability. The higher levels of the assessment criteria require a wide range of structure and vocabulary both in terms of the questions and responses. High marks cannot be scored when a candidate is offered simple questions; a series of closed questions or simply respond in simple terms to alternatives offered by the teacher-examiner.

Teacher-examiners are informed that they will be expected next year to introduce the conversation topics in the Target Language, as in previous years, and that candidates should be aware of this before they enter the examination room. The use of English within the examination is not acceptable.

There were many centres who were able to help candidates fulfil their potential through skilful questioning, enabling the candidate to expand and use more complex language, eliciting a range of structures, tenses, opinions and descriptions. It should be noted that a series of closed questions, whilst helping some candidates to offer a response, will not score other than in the lower mark bands.

Administration

Many centres continue to provide an excellent service in this area. However some points to note are summarised below:

- Cassette boxes and tapes should be labelled meticulously. It is helpful to use the inlay in the Instructions for Conduct booklet. Each should be labelled with Specification Name and Number, Centre name and number, candidate name and number, level of entry, order of recording and name of teacher examiner.

- Cassettes should be numbered sequentially across the centre, not by individual teacher examiners.

- Cassettes should be rewound to the start of side A.

- Cassettes should be dispatched with the Attendance Register. The L3s should be in a different package.

- Candidates' performance should not be split between sides of the cassette or on two different cassettes.

- Foundation and Higher-level candidates should be recorded on different cassettes.

- L3 mark sheets for each candidate should be arranged in candidate number order across the whole centre.

- In 2B centres both copies of the L3 should be sent to the examiner.

- Centres should adhere to the time limits for sending materials to examiners.

- The conversation section has time limits to be observed.

- Introductions on tape of candidates should be effected as briskly as possible in the interests of allowing the candidate to begin speaking.

- The microphone should favour the candidate rather than the teacher- examiner. Centre should be aware that where automatic recording levels are achieved by some tape recorders candidate details are at times inaudible.

- Parcels should be securely packaged for posting using protective bubble wrap or similar for the protection of the tapes.

Conclusion

Although reports on examinations invariably highlight difficulties, it must be stressed that the majority of teacher examiners prepare and carry out this element of the examination successfully.
Many candidates were well prepared for the examination and there was evidence of excellent examining technique.
Examiners would like to thank teacher-examiners for their efforts this year.

Paper 3F – Reading and Responding

Candidates were well prepared for this paper on the whole and the majority were entered appropriately.

The paper was completed in the given time with very few candidates leaving answers blank.

Presentation was good with very few candidates writing overwriting letters.

The straightforward vocabulary testing questions were well done on the whole. In Q1, however, very few candidates scored full marks. The word *trousse* was not known and (e) was often chosen for *crayon*. The words *cahier* and *livre* were often confused. Q4 on the other hand, was attempted with greater success, candidates seeming to be very familiar with the vocabulary, which was very pleasing. All parts were done well, however, part (iv) was the least successfully answered with many giving B or F as answers thereby not understanding *en face*.

The overlap questions were tackled with varying success. Pictorial questions in the past have been quite straightforward. However, this year Q2 proved to be quite challenging. This was because of not only a lack of vocabulary knowledge, especially of *assiettes, tasses* and *ciel*, but also the snatching of words and pictures. This led to the choice of A for part (a), where candidates were obviously matching the picture of the lady with *mere* in the question. In part (c), many chose C, thereby matching the town name. However, parts (d) and (e) were done quite successfully.

Candidates seemed to find Q3 challenging. A lack of detailed reading and true understanding of whole sentences combined with the snatching of key words resulted in a rather disappointing performance. For (a), candidates often missed the phrase *nous n'avons pas de télé* and therefore gave (i) as a correct answer. Part (b) was done well, but choices for (c) were sometimes the incorrect options, as candidates did not equate *toutes les deux semaines* in the text with *tous les 15 jours* in the question. Part (d) was the least successful with very few choosing the correct answer, but opting for (i) instead, having snatched the word *roman* from the text. The same process resulted in (i) being chosen in part (e) where candidates honed in on the word *artiste*, missing the negative and without reading on further to discover what Guillaume's ambition was.

The English question 5 was very well attempted on the whole with quite a few scoring full marks and very few leaving blank answers. However, those who did not score so well did so through snatching and misinterpretation of words, loose interpretations and lack of careful reading. Part (a) was answered well, but many gave June as an answer possibly derived from *jeunes* or middle of the holidays from *centre de vacances*. A.s.a.p was also a frequent answer. Others interpreted the question as where rather than when, which resulted in such answers as travel agency or library (from *libre*) or answers such as holiday rep were given. Part (b) was well done as was (d) though many failed to read the text in the latter and guessed that one had to ring or go to see the employer, often giving the postcode as a telephone number. (c) caused the most problems through lack of careful reading. Some gave a specific job in the restaurant or misinterpreted *travailler* to give the answer *travel to the restaurant*. Loose interpretations of *jouer avec les enfants* gave rise to such answers as *work with/look after children* or the usual *infants*. Very few candidates attempted *aider les animateurs*, but those who did, interpreted *animateurs* as something to do with animals or cartoons.

3H – Reading and Responding

This report is based on a very small candidature. Most candidates were appropriately entered, completing the paper in the given time. However, there were a number who seemed to struggle with the more challenging questions.
The paper seemed to differentiate well between those who only honed in on isolated lexical items and those who read the text in detail and were able to comprehend the texts globally, a higher skill which is tested at this level.

For the overlap questions, see the report on the Foundation paper. However, candidates on this paper tackled these questions with greater success.

The test type in Q2 is not new to the Reading paper and was successfully completed by the stronger candidates. However, the weaker ones didn't cope very well at all with it. Some gave more than one answer per question. There was also a sense of candidates not really understanding the sort of word required in the gaps. However, parts (iii) and (iv) were completed more correctly than the others.

Q3 was a test type used often before and candidates seemed better prepared for it this year. Parts (a), (c) and (d) were well done, but A and D were often chosen for part (b), candidates possibly interpreting *la principale* as meaning principle or imagining that the head tries to stop the violence. A and F were popular answers for part (e), candidates perhaps using their grammatical knowledge for the latter answer, but not considering or understanding the text.

The English question was attempted by all candidates with very few leaving blank answers or answering in French. Strong candidates scored full marks whilst weaker candidates who were inappropriately entered often snatched at isolated words, especially "accidents", which resulted in a proliferation of answers involving this idea. In other cases, candidates just seemed to ignore the text and make up their own answers.

The most common incorrect answers included: (a) *accidents; tiredness* and *impatient drivers; (b)accidents; nervousness; road rage (s'endormir* seemed to be unknown); (c) *reduce accidents; relieves tension; stretch*. For part (d), candidates read the question, then honed in on the idea of dangerous driving, but then a lack of detailed reading of the text resulted in such answers as: *likes danger; always in a rush and very dangerous; likes driving dangerously; doesn't know it's dangerous; doesn't care about danger*. Others guessed with answers like *thinks of other things; doesn't pay attention*. Similarly in part (e), candidates read the question, noticed the word accidents and gave such answers as: *he hasn't had an accident; knows how to avoid accidents; pays attention; takes time and drives slowly.*

Paper 4C – Written Coursework

This year coursework was again more popular than the examination. It was pleasing to see that in the vast majority of centres candidates produced good work according to their potential, and teachers administered and assessed the work very successfully. Moderators noted an encouraging overall improvement in performance.

Tasks

The best tasks allowed candidates to use a variety of tenses, structures and vocabulary in each unit of work. They demonstrated linking, opinion and logical argument. Weaker candidates were able to write simple sentences and paragraphs without slavish adherence to stimulus material.

Examples of successful tasks included:
1. 'Agony Aunt' letters and replies
2. Film reviews – the most popular were *Amélie* and *Jean de Florette*
3. Lives of famous personalities, including historical ones
4. Imagining how the candidate's town would look in the future
5. Health issues such as healthy eating
6. The environment
7. Holidays
8. School and work experience
9. Narratives
10. Topics selected by individual candidates, such as *La maladie de maman* and *Le mariage à Amsterdam*

Poorer tasks did not encourage candidates to use more than one tense. Language was repetitive, with excessive reliance on the stimulus, and there was little standardisation of task choice within the centre.

Examples of less successful tasks included:
1. Daily routine – this tended to be confined to the present tense
2. Local area – often no more than lists of buildings
3. Interviews – where no attempt was made to link the task together into a coherent whole
4. House and home – again, this frequently amounted to a series of lists
5. Topics which had not been well differentiated for the ability of the candidate – for example, gap-filling tasks given to candidates capable of writing sentences and paragraphs, or complex topics given to candidates who lacked the resources to deal with them

Successful stimulus material was brief, often in the form of a title plus bullet points. Some centres used past exam papers (Specification 1226 Paper 4) to good effect. Most stimulus material was in French, although moderators again noted a good deal in English. Often, centres chose safe and predictable topics, and only the better candidates were able to develop these quite unpromising titles into good pieces of work that fulfilled the criteria for higher marks. Some centres appeared unsure of the difference between stimulus and reference materials. The latter might include textbook pages or grammar worksheets which help candidates with a particular piece of vocabulary or with a more complex structure. They only became a problem when candidates copied whole sentences or even paragraphs from them – and sometimes the same copied work was seen across a whole centre. Moderators are looking to see how individual candidates manipulate the language to make it their own.

Candidates in a few centres were penalised because they had not been asked to fulfil the specification requirement of writing three units of work from three different topic areas. Where candidates had written two units from one topic area, only the better of the two marks was taken into consideration, and the other mark was discounted. Clearly this had a serious effect on the overall marks of such centres. In the most serious cases, teachers had selected three titles from the same topic area. Centres are reminded to check the specification carefully before setting tasks, and to ensure that different teaching groups are all being set work that conforms to the specification.

The excessive length of submissions was an issue in a few centres. It is quite possible to obtain good marks for work which meets the specification demands: 250-350 words overall for grades G-D, and 500-600 words overall for grades C-A* (Short Course: 200-250 words overall for grades G-D, and 350-400 words overall for grades C-A*). The units of work (three for the Full Course, two for the Short Course) should be of roughly equal length, including the one done under controlled conditions.

Some centres did not meet the requirements for controlled conditions, and they too were penalised by having the marks of one unit discounted. Controlled conditions work must be done in the classroom and under the supervision of a teacher. Stimulus material and a dictionary are allowed; reference materials, notes or first drafts of the work are not permitted. Candidates may prepare the work in advance and may wish to memorise parts of it; it is not however in the spirit of the examination to invite candidates to learn by heart pieces of French which they have not composed themselves, such as textbook pages. The controlled conditions unit must be of roughly the same length as the other units.

If candidates make drafts of their work, these must not be corrected by the teacher. Feedback should only be given in the form of general comments; the use of form CFS1 must be used for this purpose. Drafts should be clearly identified and should be included with the sample. Moderators are instructed to ignore final drafts in those cases where first drafts have been marked with specific corrections, and to mark first drafts.

Candidates are encouraged to use ICT when composing their coursework. They are however urged to check spellings carefully, especially accents. Overuse of cutting and pasting is unlikely to enhance the marks awarded. The use of Internet translation devices is not permitted, and centres are asked not to authenticate work produced in this way.

Dictionary use was generally good, but there were problems for some candidates. Use of Internet dictionaries did not appear to be as successful as use of conventional books.

Assessment

On the whole, this was very well done by centres. Some were slightly generous but consistently so. Internal standardisation was usually successful. The three marking grids provided in the specification were well used, although sometimes too much credit was given to work copied from a stimulus, to pedestrian or formulaic work, and to work which was too short to meet the criteria. It is necessary to take into consideration both the length and type of task when awarding a mark for Communication and content. For Knowledge and application of language, a mark of 4 indicates some attempt at using more complex structures such as past infinitives, object pronouns, adverbial phrases and negatives. A pleasing number of candidates did meet this requirement this year. In the Accuracy grid, it should be noted that the majority of verb forms have to be correct in order to achieve 3 or more marks.

Administration

Most centres were extremely helpful in following the requirements of the Instructions for the Conduct of the Examination (the ICE booklet), which are issued well in advance of coursework deadlines. When centres failed to do this, it held up the moderation process and in some cases penalised candidates. There were various specific problems, and centres are asked to ensure that the following takes place:

1. The latest version of form CF1 (coursework front sheet) should be used.
2. It should include candidate number and be signed by teacher and candidate.
3. It should contain an accurate word count and an indication of topic areas chosen.
4. Addition of marks should be carefully checked.
5. The OPTEMS form should be completed in full, without error, and should be signed on every page.
6. Teaching groups should be indicated on the OPTEMS.
7. If separated, OPTEMS pages should be placed in their correct order.
8. Absent candidates should be marked X not zero.
9. The sample should be arranged in candidate number order.
10. If a sample candidate is absent, then the work of the next candidate on the list should be included.
11. The work of the candidates with the highest and lowest marks should be included.
12. Work in the folder should be in the same order as on the front sheet.
13. There should be no loose pages – especially ones with no name on.
14. Stimulus material should be submitted – not references to pages in a textbook.
15. When moderators request additional information or folders, these should be provided promptly.

Statistical Information

GCSE French 3226 – June 2004

Grade Boundaries

Paper Number	Max Paper Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1F	50				15	12	10	8	6
1H	50	118	115	112	110	108	107		
2F	50				27	22	18	14	10
2H	150	140	134	128	123	117	114		
3F	50				16	13	10	7	4
3H	50	117	114	111	108	106	105		
4C	60	34	30	26	22	18	14	10	6

The figures given above are the minimum raw marks for each grade boundary on each papers. Please refer to the tables on the following pages for the raw mark to UMS conversions. The number of UMS points required to achieve each overall grade is shown below.

NB 100 marks are added to all Higher Level papers for administrative purposes.

GRADE	Max	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
POINTS	360	320	280	240	200	160	120	80	40	<40

The table below shows that each of the four skills is worth 25% of the final grade. The mean mark and standard deviation for each paper are also shown.

Subject Number and Title		Paper Number and Title		% Contribution to Award	Mean Mark	Standard Deviation
3226	French	1F	LISTENING FOUNDATION	25	10.4	3.3
3226	French	1H	LISTENING HIGHER		108.8	4.0
3226	French	2FB	SPEAKING FOUNDATION B	25	15.2	7.5
3226	French	2HB	SPEAKING HIGHER B		127.1	9.9
3226	French	3F	READING FOUNDATION	25	13.1	3.5
3226	French	3H	READING HIGHER		108.8	4.6
3226	French	4C	COURSEWORK	25	14.9	7.1

Subject Number and Title		Number Sat	Pass %	Cumulative Percentages of Candidates at Specified Grades								
				A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
3226	French	977	96.8	0.3	1.2	3.0	9.8	28.2	52.2	82.5	96.8	100.0

Raw Mark to UMS Score Conversion Table
Paper 1 – Listening & Responding

Foundation Tier		Higher Tier	
Raw Mark	UMS Score	Raw Mark	UMS Score
25	59	125	90
24	59	124	90
23	59	123	90
22	59	122	90
21	59	121	90
20	59	120	87
19	59	119	83
18	59	118	80
17	56	117	77
16	53	116	73
15	50	115	70
14	47	114	67
13	43	113	63
12	40	112	60
11	35	111	55
10	30	110	50
9	25	109	45
8	20	108	40
7	15	107	35
6	10	106	30
5	8	105	25
4	7	104	20
3	5	103	15
2	3	102	10
1	2	101	5
0	0	100	0

Raw Mark to UMS Score Conversion Table
Paper 2 – Speaking

Foundation Tier		Higher Tier	
Raw Mark	UMS Score	Raw Mark	UMS Score
50	59	150	90
49	59	149	90
48	59	148	90
47	59	147	90
46	59	146	90
45	59	145	88
44	59	144	87
43	59	143	85
42	59	142	83
41	59	141	82
40	59	140	80
39	59	139	78
38	59	138	77
37	59	137	75
36	59	136	73
35	59	135	72
34	59	134	70
33	59	133	68
32	59	132	67
31	57	131	65
30	55	130	63
29	54	129	62
28	52	128	60
27	50	127	58
26	48	126	56
25	46	125	54
24	44	124	52
23	42	123	50
22	40	122	48
21	38	121	47
20	35	120	45
19	33	119	43
18	30	118	42
17	28	117	40
16	25	116	38
15	23	115	37
14	20	114	35
13	18	113	33
12	15	112	30
11	13	111	28
10	10	110	25
9	9	109	23
8	8	108	20
7	7	107	18
6	6	106	15
5	5	105	13
4	4	104	10
3	3	103	8
2	2	102	5
1	1	101	3
0	0	100	0

Raw Mark to UMS Score Conversion Table
Paper 3 – Reading & Responding

Foundation Tier	
Raw Mark	UMS Score
25	59
24	59
23	59
22	59
21	59
20	59
19	59
18	56
17	53
16	50
15	47
14	43
13	40
12	37
11	33
10	30
9	27
8	23
7	20
6	17
5	13
4	10
3	8
2	5
1	3
0	0

Higher Tier	
Raw Mark	UMS Score
125	90
124	90
123	90
122	90
121	90
120	90
119	87
118	83
117	80
116	77
115	73
114	70
113	67
112	63
111	60
110	57
109	53
108	50
107	45
106	40
105	35
104	28
103	21
102	14
101	7
100	0

Raw Mark to UMS Score Conversion Table
Paper 4C – Coursework

Raw Mark	UMS Score
40	90
39	90
38	90
37	88
36	85
35	83
34	80
33	78
32	75
31	73
30	70
29	68
28	65
27	63
26	60
25	58
24	55
23	53
22	50
21	48
20	45
19	43
18	40
17	38
16	35
15	33
14	30
13	28
12	25
11	23
10	20
9	18
8	15
7	13
6	10
5	8
4	7
3	5
2	3
1	2
0	0

edexcel