

**Combined Mark Schemes
And Report on the Components**

June 2005

1925/MS/R/05

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2005

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annersley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

GCSE French 1925

MARK SCHEMES FOR THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
2351	Listening	1
2352/5	Speaking	13
2353	Reading	19
2354	Writing	25

REPORT ON THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
*	Introduction	34
2351	Listening	35
2352	Speaking (Externally Assessed)	38
2353	Reading	43
2354	Writing	46
2355	Speaking (Internally Assessed)	51
2356	Writing Coursework	55
*	Grade Thresholds	59

**Mark Scheme 2351
June 2005**

OCR GCSE FRENCH LISTENING (1925/2351) – MAY 2005

A - MARK SCHEME

Please study the mark scheme notes accompanying this answer guide.

SECTION 1

Exercise 1

[see marking strategy 7]

- | | | | |
|----|----------|----|----------|
| 1. | B | 3. | A |
| 2. | C | 4. | C |
| | | 5. | C |

[Total: 5]

Exercise 2

6. **A**
7. **F**
8. **D**
9. **E**
10. **B**
11. **G**

[Total: 6]

Exercise 3 ***(Paired answers are interchangeable)***

12. **A; F**
13. **C; K**
14. **E; M**
15. **H; G**

[Total: 8]

Exercice 4

- 16. **B**
- 17. **G**
- 18. **F**
- 19. **A**
- 20. **H**
- 21. **C**

[Total: 6]

Exercice 5 ***(Award if correct word clearly selected – do not penalise spelling errors.)***

- 22. ***sud***
- 23. ***plage***
- 24. ***45***
- 25. ***minuit***
- 26. ***l'été***

[Total: 5]

SECTION 2

Exercise 1

1. B
2. C
3. C
4. A
5. A

[Total: 5]

Exercise 2

6. E
7. F
8. G
9. D
10. B

[Total: 5]

Exercise 3 (See notes on answering questions in French)

11. (en) montagne / à / au / près de la / des montagne(s)

MUST START "MONTA"+N SOUND

montanne / montange / montanye /
montangue / montaine / montanya

ignore addition of "famille / maison"

montage / montainy /
monetanya / montany/

12. 14/20 (Both required correctly for mark)

MUST START "QUAT / KAT / CAT" except:

quartoze / quartorze /
quatrose / quatroz

if another French word
eg: vent / vient / vin / van

13. deux/2 adult(e)s; 3 enfants (infants)

MUST START "ADU"

en fant / atude / adut
parents / jeunes /anfants /unfants
deuz / twa / trois / tois / trios

toi / thois

14. *machine (à) laver*
accept addition of cuisine
ignore any additions to 14a
machine lave / machine a lavais
machine de lave / machine et laver

lave-vaisselle / machine à lever
machine lava / machine alaver
machine la vais

[Total: 4]

Exercice 4

- 15. **A (bien)**
- 16. **B (pas bien)**
- 17. **A (bien)**
- 18. **C (pas certain)**
- 19. **B (pas bien)**
- 20. **B (pas bien)**

[Total: 6]

SECTION 3

Exercice 1

- 1. **K**
- 2. **D**
- 3. **A**
- 4. **E**
- 5. **H**
- 6. **J**
- 7. **G**
- 8. **B**

[Total: 8]

Exercice 2 (See notes on marking answers in French).

ACCEPT

9. **vendredi**

**MUST START “VEND / VENT VAND / VANT /
except venredi**

10. **centre / centre-ville / centre de Lille
centre la ville / centrale de ville**

11. **moto(s) / motto / mauto**

12. **finit / termine / dure / arrête
conclut / finit jusqu'à
ignore renderings of jusqu'à
accept recognisable verb endings**

13. **plus
plus de / plus que / le plus /
plu / plue / plut / plus mieux**

REJECT

**Friday / venerdi
vendre / vendre dis**

**Lille /
INCLUSION OF PARC
ville de centre / ville tc
cent de ville**

**Lille / motor / moteur
mouto**

**jusqu'à tc / dire jusqu'à
dur / fin**

très / mieux / beaucoup

[Total: 5]

Exercice 3

14. **B**

15. **C**

16. **A**

17. **A**

18. **C**

19. **C**

20. **A**

[Total: 7]

Exercise 4 Count number of ticks first

21. The following 5 boxes ticked:

(a)

(c)

(e)

(f)

(j)

Deduct one mark for each box in excess of 5 ticked.

[Total: 5]

Exercise 5 (See notes on marking questions in English).

ACCEPT

REJECT

22.	(French) (Air France) (co) pilot polit	wrong nationality / JFK someone at JFK airport
23.	had a bomb(s) (hidden) in his shoe explosives / trainers / shoes / boot/s bomb in shoe / there was a shoe bomb bomb attached to shoe	sock / wrong place bomb in bag something in shoe someone's shoe bomb in a shoe shop bomb in her shoe
24.	7 years in prison / jail / gaol up to 7 years in prison he is doing 7 years / 7 years tc	wrong number omission of 7 years a long time in prison
25.	examined/checked plane (concept) searched / inspected	looked in the plane examined his bags examined him add. of him / luggage checked planes
26.	flight/plane /cancelled / stopped withheld / grounded passengers / they were delayed they had to wait / late from airport journey was delayed they didn't fly that day they were/left late	flight was delayed flight was postponed specific time slightly delayed delayed until next Friday flight<u>S</u> / plane<u>S</u>

NB Do NOT penalise plural if already penalised at Question 25

[Total: 5]

GCSE FRENCH LISTENING – MAY 2005. MARKING NOTES

Please read these notes carefully before the meeting and refer to them frequently during your marking.

Marking Strategies

- 1 If an answer is very untidy, try to decipher it, but if it is illegible mark it wrong.
- 2 If one answer has been written on top of another such that both are equally visible, mark the answer wrong.
- 3 Correct answers written in the wrong spaces are generally to be marked wrong (but see strategy 5 below).
- 4 Where LISTS of possible answers are offered where only one is required, mark the first only and ignore the others. Ignore correct but irrelevant information (non-distorting material) included with the answer. The list rule does not generally operate on Section 3, where the inclusion of any incorrect answer will lead to the withholding of the mark.
- 5 Where the space for answers is set out as (a) and (b), mark the first answer on each line. If two answers are written at (a) and nothing at (b), mark the two at (a) and award the marks accordingly. Note that answers to (a) and (b) are usually interchangeable.
- 6 Where one answer is required but two are written, ONE ABOVE THE OTHER, mark the one on or nearer to the line. Use discretion, however, in deciding whether the candidate is clearly indicating that one particular answer is to be marked.
- 7 Where a candidate makes two choices on a multiple-choice question requiring only one answer, the mark is automatically lost, unless there is a clear indication as to which answer to mark.
- 8 A correct answer can be invalidated by the addition of incorrect material. In this case the answer will score nought. Indicate this by marking as 1-1. Care needs to be exercised in distinguishing between incorrect and irrelevant/non-distorting material. Do not confuse invalidation and the list rule.
- 9 Where an answer is ambiguous and could equally well be judged right or wrong, decide in the candidate's favour.
- 10 There will be cases requiring professional judgement in deciding how to mark a particular answer. This will be especially so on Section 3 Exercise 5 where we are often looking for a correct concept in an answer rather than an individual word. In such instances, always follow the general guidelines above, the examples given in the scheme and discussed at the standardisation meeting and in the tape script itself in reaching a decision (bearing in mind that the tape script is HEARD and NOT SEEN by the candidates!).

MARKING ANSWERS IN ENGLISH

We judge answers from the standpoint of the “sympathetic English reader” with no knowledge of French.

Answers given in French are marked wrong unless they are near cognates (e.g. “*novembre*”).

Be tolerant of poor English spelling. Always accept an incorrectly spelled answer provided it is recognisable as the correct word.

MARKING ANSWERS IN FRENCH

Answers given in English cannot be credited (but see below).

The quality of French produced is not to be assessed.

We take the part of the “sympathetic French reader” with no knowledge of English.

An answer will be credited if it looks reasonably correct (i.e. to the French reader) and could not be confused with another word – i.e. tolerate spelling errors which do not impede comprehension.

An answer which does not immediately appear “reasonably correct” should be read aloud as it would by a French speaker. If this results phonetically in a recognisable version of the required word, it is accepted.

English/French cognates or near-cognates (e.g. “september”) are to be accepted because they would be recognised by a French person.

In general, if a misspelled word in French leads to a different word, with resultant ambiguity, it is rejected (e.g. *soir* for *soeur*, *voter* for *voiture*).

On Sections 2 and 3 one is more likely to have to consider a phrase rather than a single word. The above rules should again be followed. Within a phrase, however, one can be more tolerant of misspelled words, as there is less chance of their leading to ambiguity (e.g. *il amie* for *il aime* or *à huit ours* for *à huit heures*).

Marking problems arise when assessing to what extent an incorrectly spelled answer in French would be comprehensible to a French reader. There will also be cases where it is impossible to know whether candidates have shown that they have understood the required concept or have merely transliterated the French. In such cases, the above principles should first be followed. Then use professional judgement in coming to a decision. Although the principle of awarding in favour of the candidate can be followed in cases of ambiguity, this should not be literally interpreted in every instance. In other words, the answer should first be judged following the above principles; if it fails on this scrutiny, it cannot be awarded.

**Mark Scheme 2352
June 2005**

1.1 SCHEME OF ASSESSMENT

Foundation Tier		Marks
Section 1 Role Play	Communication	8
Section 2 Role Play	Communication	8
Presentation	Communication	4
Discussion and Conversation	Communication	10
Overall Linguistic Quality	Accuracy	20
Total		50

Higher Tier		Marks
Section 2 Role Play	Communication	8
Section 3 Narrative RP	Communication	8
Presentation	Communication	4
Discussion and Conversation	Communication	10
Overall Linguistic Quality	Accuracy	20
Total		50

Section 1 Role Play, 4 items, marked 2, 1, 0

2	Candidate successfully communicates the message without ambiguity and with little assistance from the examiner Incorrect use of the 'you' form overlooked at this level.
1	Candidate partially communicates the message OR Candidate eventually communicates the message after considerable assistance from the examiner, without being fed the answer
0	Candidate fails to communicate the message or is fed the answer by the examiner

Section 2 Role Play, 4 items, marked 2, 1, 0

2	Candidate successfully communicates the message without ambiguity and with little assistance from the examiner, using the appropriate tense. Inappropriate use of the 'you' form qualifies for a maximum of 1 mark on the first occurrence only.
1	Candidate partially communicates the message OR Candidate eventually communicates the message after considerable assistance from the examiner, without being fed the answer
0	Candidate fails to communicate the message or is fed the answer by the examiner

Section 3 Narrative Role Play

8	All main points communicated. Some imaginative detail added. Responds readily to interjections. Confident. Gives opinions and justifications. Very fluent. Maintains good pace.
7/6	Conveys all the main points with little ambiguity. Little guidance needed. Easy interchanges with examiner. Gives opinions and justifications. Quite fluent. Maintains reasonably good pace.
5/4	Communicates most of the main points. Some guidance needed from the examiner. Responds to queries from the examiner about ambiguities. Gives limited range of opinions and justifications when prompted. Pace varies somewhat. Reasonably fluent.
3/2	Communicates some of the main points, but the overall picture is somewhat unclear. Needs much guidance from the examiner, and responds hesitantly. Pace slow. Lacks fluency
1/0	Communicates isolated points only. No overall picture communicated. Has difficulty in responding to examiner. Pace very slow. Little fluency.

This is a 'best fit' exercise. Where some qualities are lacking, the lower of two marks in the mark band will be appropriate.

Presentation – Communication

4 marks

4	Excellent, well-organised preparation and delivery of material. All main points communicated very clearly. A range of opinions and justifications expressed with ease.
3	Good preparation and delivery of material. All main points communicated without ambiguity. Straightforward opinions routinely expressed with some justifications.
2	Fairly good preparation and delivery of material. All main points communicated with little ambiguity. Straightforward opinions expressed.
1	Performance needs considerable examiner assistance to elicit material.
0	Absolutely nothing of merit.

For Foundation Tier it will be unusual for candidates to be awarded more than 3 marks

Discussion of Presentation and Conversation – Communication

10 marks

10	Mature Discussion of the Presentation. Both Conversation topics handled very impressively. Spontaneous interchange with examiner, shows initiative. A wide range of opinions and justifications expressed with ease. Takes the initiative in conversation. Outstanding.
9/8	Discussion of the Presentation and both Conversation topics handled well. Examiner has little need to rephrase. A range of opinions and justifications expressed with ease. Can take the initiative in conversation.
7/6	Discusses the Presentation reasonably well. Develops both Conversation topics reasonably well OR has one strong and one weak topic. Expresses opinions. Communicates clearly, despite errors.
5/4	Discussion of the Presentation pedestrian, with the examiner leading questioning a good deal. Conversation topics dealt with in a straightforward but limited way. Examiner may need to rephrase questions before they are understood. Communicates obvious points, despite a good number of errors.
3/2	Discussion of the Presentation laboured, with the examiner doing most of the work. Conversation topics only work with considerable input from the examiner, and generally only understands simple questions when they are rephrased. Only some points clearly communicated, and many errors.
1/0	Little or nothing of merit.

For Foundation Tier it will be unusual for candidates to be awarded more than 7 marks

Linguistic quality – covers the whole examination except the Presentation 20 marks

20/19	Confident and very accurate use of a variety of tenses appropriate to subject matter. Wide range of structures and vocabulary with occasional isolated errors in more complex language. Responds at considerable length to open questions. Pronunciation and intonation extremely accurate for a non-native speaker.
18/17/16	Very good and consistent use of a variety of tenses appropriate to subject matter. Very good range of structures and vocabulary. Consistent use of more complex language features. Pronunciation and intonation very accurate for a non-native speaker.
15/14	Good consistent use of tense appropriate to subject matter with only occasional errors. Good range of structures and vocabulary. Some errors in more complex language. Pronunciation and intonation mostly accurate with only occasional slips.
13/12/11	Use of past, present and future tenses appropriate, but with some inaccuracies and inconsistencies. Fair range of structures and vocabulary. Pronunciation and intonation generally accurate with occasional hesitation.
10/9	General awareness and some use of tenses appropriate to subject matter, but many inaccuracies. Adequate range of structures and vocabulary. Pronunciation and intonation generally accurate, but some errors. Hesitant at times
8/7	Some awareness and limited use of different tenses. Generally appropriate attempts at subject/verb accord. Fairly limited range of structures and vocabulary. Pronunciation and intonation fair, but inconsistent. Some hesitation.
6/5/4	Limited success in attempts at subject/verb accord. Very limited range of structures and vocabulary. Pronunciation and intonation approximate but intelligible. Hesitant delivery.
3/2	Very occasional awareness and success at subject/verb accord. Very limited range of vocabulary. Answers brief and often monosyllabic. Pronunciation very approximate and delivery very hesitant.
1/0	Little or nothing of merit.

For Foundation Tier it will be unusual for candidates to be awarded more than 13 marks

**Mark Scheme 2353
June 2005**

SECTION 1

Ex 1 1. A [1] 2. C [1] 3. B [1] 4. B [1] 5. A [1]	
Ex 2 6. F [1] 7. K [1] 8. E [1] 9. A [1] 10. D [1] 11. B [1] 12. C [1]	
Ex 3 13. icons ticked for [4] potatoes, butter, eggs, tuna	N.B. If more than 4 boxes are ticked, 1 mark will be deducted for each additional box ticked.
Ex 4 14. C [1] 15. B [1] 16. C [1]	
Ex 5 17. H [1] 18. A [1] 19. J [1] 20. F [1] 21. K [1] 22. G [1]	
Ex 6 23. A [1] 24. C [1] 25. C [1] 26. B [1] 27. C [1]	

Total 30 marks

POST-STANDARDISATION MARK SCHEME SECTION 2

EX 1	
1. un voyage	[1]
2. difficile	[1]
3. après le 28 août	[1]
4. n'a pas réussi	[1]
5. n'était pas malade	[1]
6. va bientôt faire	[1]

EX 2	
7. B	[1]
8. C,G	[2]
9. E	[1]
10. A	[1]
11. D,C	[2]
12. E	[1]
13. D	[1]

EX 3	ACCEPT		REJECT
14.	200000 / two hundred thousand / 200k wrong <u>figure</u> followed by right <u>words</u>	1	right figure + wrong words
15.	it is/was his birthplace/he was born there it is/was his home town he is/was/comes/came from there	1	he lives/lived there addition of "celebrity" invalidates.
16.	first/best/top tourist town/town for tourists/tourism (in France) first=premier/e, number 1 (or IDEA) town=city,village, place, site, location, attraction, destination, spot, centre tourists=holidaymakers, trippers, visitors	1	most popular biggest main "tops/best for tourism" anything with the idea of size or the number of tourists.
17.	mustard/mou <u>st</u> ard(e)/m <u>ust</u> erd	1	moutarde
18.	art lover(s)/ those who appreciate art appreciate=like, love, are interested in art= arts, artwork(s), art exhibitions, the art(s) lovers=enthusiasts, fans ref. to weekend is h.a.	1	artists/ art people art t.c. "the art of Dijon" beware of invalidating additions e.g. "art and culture"

Total 20 marks

POST-STANDARDISATION MARK SCHEME SECTION 3

Ex 1	ACCEPT		REJECT
1(a)	(aller/partir en/pour les) vacances Be tolerant of 'lifts' from the text	1	pour gagner de l'argent
1(b)	vivre (confortablement pendant l'année qui suit) l'année t.c. Be tolerant of 'lifts' from the text 1(a) and 1(b) in either order	1	
2.	animateur/comme animateur pour organiser (quelques heures par jour) des jeux et des sports Be tolerant of incorrect pronoun	1	jouer des jeux/des sports WHERE
3.	(aller) à la plage/activités de vacancier be tolerant of pronoun and tense	1	activité(s) t.c. sports et jeux=invalidating addition
4.	le même travail/animateur/le même genre de poste un poste comme ça (dans un coin différent) le même	1	comme ça t.c addition of "en Corse" invalidates
5.	A	1	
6.	B	1	

Ex 2

- | | |
|--------------|-----|
| 7. sautant | [1] |
| 8. poids | [1] |
| 9. attendre | [1] |
| 10. plus | [1] |
| 11. regardé | [1] |
| 12. équipe | [1] |
| 13. nerveuse | [1] |
| 14. courte | [1] |

Ex 3

- | | |
|-------|-----|
| 15. C | [1] |
| 16. J | [1] |
| 17. G | [1] |
| 18. D | [1] |
| 19. B | [1] |
| 20. E | [1] |
| 21. H | [1] |
| 22. L | [1] |
| 23. M | [1] |
| 24. A | [1] |

POST-STANDARDISATION MARK SCHEME SECTION 3 (continued)

Ex 4	ACCEPT		REJECT
25	(in the) sixties/nineteen-sixties/1960s	1	1960
26.	there is (more) room/space (to relax)(IDEA) it is less crowded "it is a place which is not too crowded" "it is a place where there is (more)space/room"	1	spaces place(s) e.g. it is a place where you can relax =0
27a	beginning/start of summer early summer	1	summer t.c
27b	3 elements needed (A, B, C) <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: flex-start;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: 150px; height: 100px;"> <p>A to see/look at/visit/go to it is close to</p> </div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: 100px; height: 80px;"> <p>B (famous) gardens</p> </div> </div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: 150px; height: 100px; margin: 0 auto;"> <p>C of Monet of famous painter at/in Giverny painted by Monet</p> </div> <p>OR to see/look at/visit/go to/it is close to Giverny</p>	1	celebrity to celebrate Monet and Giverny The gardens by Monet
28	(continued) improvements to the campsite (IDEA) improve = make better, upgrade, enhance, do up	1	camping expand/enlarge/develop

Total 30 marks

**Mark Scheme 2354
June 2005**

EXAMPLES OF UN/ACCEPTABLE ANSWERS

The responses below do not constitute a list of the required answers for the 2005 paper but are exemplars which illustrate the principles of the Mark Scheme.

SECTION 1
Question 1
ACCEPTABLE
UNACCEPTABLE
1. Words must be in French...

plage
château

playa
Kino

... or may be identically spelt English words, having the same meaning in French...

discothèque
cinéma

park
car

2. Words must be relevant within the meaning of the question.

i.e. they must be places (and they do not need to be confined to those illustrated on the question paper)...

piscine
chez ma tante
magasin

natation
oncle/oncle's
magazine

...but they must **not** be those proscribed by the rubric...

cité
Disneyland
monta....
Montangue

Paris
Espagne
mount....
compagne / compaigne
mere / mère

3. Words must be written such that they would be comprehensible to a sympathetic native speaker of French...

margasin
magazin / magasin / magazine

masgin

... or, if not immediately comprehensible on the page, if they would **sound** like a French word on being read aloud by the sympathetic native speaker...

aiglize

eggles

4. Words are not invalidated by erroneous additional material...

Le piscines
Vais les campagne

5. Words are not invalidated by erroneous or missing accentuation...

La plagé
L'hotel

6. Listed, repetitive words, concepts or phrases are acceptable as follows...

When a generic word has a specific exemplar, both are accepted...

Terrain de sports (✓)
Terrain de foot (✓)

When a list of specific exemplars is given, the generic is not accepted

Terrain de golf (✓)

Terrain de sports (X)

Terrain de foot (✓)
Terrain de rugby (✓)

Question 2**COMMUNICATION****ACCEPTABLE****UNACCEPTABLE****7. Nouns, verbs and phrases must be relevant within the meaning of the question, i.e. they must capture the idea of the picture.**

They must respond to the spirit of the visual stimulus, but do not have to respond to the grammatical stimulus...

No. 1	danse bois	lis me douche
No. 2	mes amis les filles mon père / other male family member	no proper names English or French
No. 3	joue regarde	lave ferme
No. 4	mon jardin le parc	ma chambre les animaux
No. 5	lis J'ecris travaille	donne arrive
No. 6	ma chambre cuisine	le parc ma tante

NB: a) "j'alle" is acceptable.

b) If candidate attempts future tense using "aller", infinitive must be correct in order to earn "+".

8. Words are not invalidated by erroneous additional material, provided it does not obscure the meaning...

No. 1	danse dans	danse quitte
No. 2	Mon les amis	mes amitiés gens
No. 3	jouer	jouer droit
No. 4	Ma maison jardin	arbre public jardin
No. 5	lisais dans	lisais apres
No. 6	ma salle de chambre école / jardin / bibliothèque	petit-déjeuner chambre

9. Repetition of words or phrases is not acceptable.

Whilst it could be argued that *regarde* will fit Nos. 1, 3 and 5 semantically, when the same word is used more than once, it is credited only on its first appearance.

QUALITY**ACCEPTABLE****UNACCEPTABLE****10. "Plus" marks for Quality are awarded for spelling.**

They are awarded when the main word (usually the noun or the verb) in the candidate's response is spelt correctly...

mon le jardin fais becoup mes	mon jadin faire beaucoup des
--	---

Question 3**COMMUNICATION****ACCEPTABLE****UNACCEPTABLE****11. The Candidate must convey fully the meaning cued by each stimulus, using a note, phrase or sentence,**

i.e. the idea(s)/concept(s) of the stimulus must be communicated (without having to show grammatical accuracy)...

No. 1	Elle Sarah et 16 ans	Elle 16
No. 2	Sarah habite/maison a York "Maison" alone is acceptable.	York
Accept correct French spelling of UK towns: Londres, Edimbourg		
No. 3	Elle grand, yeux bleu ...	Elle les cheveux
No. 4	Sarah être sympa ...	active
No. 5	5 personnes dans elle famille...	Je grande
No. 6	Sarah a joué au le hockey ...	Elle disco

12. Answers are not invalidated by erroneous additional material, provided it does not obscure the meaning...

No. 1	Elle est Denise et 16 ans	Elle a anglais 16
No. 3	Elle est grand, yeux bleu ...	Elle les yeux raide
No. 6	Denise a joué le hockey ...	jouer samedi disco

13. Repetitions are acceptable. For example, most of the Tasks could begin with: *Mon amie Denise*. But because the demands of the different Tasks are varied, provided the Candidate conveys the different meanings, such a repetition would not matter.**14. Combining tasks using the same initial verb is acceptable.**

For example, Tasks 3 and 4 could be run together...

Denise est petite, blonde et très sympa.

NB: Ignore (do not penalise) confusion/alternation between "il/elle/ce/c' " for communication, but penalise under Quality of language.

Je/J' not acceptable, but penalise only the first occurrence for communication

QUALITY**15. IN THE 6 -7 BAND** Candidate responses would be expected to be sentences, and some of the verbs will be correct...

Elle s'appelle Yvonne

The word order will tend to be correct...

Yvonne joue au golf

Spelling errors will be unlikely to affect the basic communication...

Elle a un chein et un cochon-dinde

There may be attempts at linkages...

Elle est mince et elle les yeux bleus

16. IN THE 4 -5 BAND some responses may be sentences, and a few of the verbs will be correct...

Elle s'apple Clara

The word order will tend to be uncertain...

Clara long cheveux

Spelling errors will affect the communication...
Elle a un poison

- 17.** IN THE 2 -3 BAND responses will tend to be notes or phrases ...
Amie Sandra

The word order will be anglicised...
Sandra's chat a blanc

Spelling errors will seriously affect the communication...
Familie mer (Tracey) et pere (Sam) et 2 soirs

NB : Mark for Quality cannot be any more than 1 mark higher than Communication.

SECTION 2

COMMUNICATION

The Candidate must try to respond relevantly and successfully in French to each of the tasks set.

The Examiner places a capital letter **T** in the left-hand margin of the script to indicate the point where the Candidate has recognisably attempted to address each task. The Examiner then assesses the degree of success in the Candidate's communication and indicates it on a four-point scale as follows:

- **T1o** shows that the Candidate has failed to communicate anything relevant for Task 1 (or has omitted the task altogether [examiner may add caret sign ^]),
e.g. q2, t4 (Question 2, Task 4): *Dans le September j'aller je travaille le Espagne sur vacations*
- **T4-** In that same Task the Candidate has achieved partial communication (see below),
e.g. *Dans septembre je suis aller a espagne avec compains.*
- **T4** The Candidate has achieved acceptable communication (see below),
e.g. *Dans septembre je vais aller a l'Espagne avec mes famille.*
- **T4+** The Candidate has achieved acceptable communication and has been able to provide further relevant material,
e.g. *Dans septembre je vais aller en vacances. Je vais en Espagne en avion avec ma famille et je vais faire le ski natuique. J'adore la mer.*

**ACCEPTABLE
COMMUNICATION**

**PARTIAL
COMMUNICATION**

18. Where the task is in two parts, both must be addressed, not necessarily using a separate verbs for each part...

Q1t1 *Je suis allé au petit resturant italien*
samedi dernier. C'est mon anniversaire.

Je suis allé au resturant italien dans le

Q2t4 *Samedi prochain je vais au cinema.*
Samedi prochain je vais sortir avec mes amis

19. Where the candidate conflates two tasks, each task must contain a finite verb to qualify as acceptable communication...

Q2ts1&2 *J'ai travaillé dans un supermarché*
très bon l'année dernière. J'ai rangé beaucoup.
(Both tasks = 2 marks)

J'ai rangé beaucoup dans un
supermarché très bon l'année dernière.
(Task 2 = 2 marks, Task 1 = 1 mark)

20. The tense of the verb must be logical as required by the task...

Q1t4 *Le weekend prochain je vais aller au*
cinéma en ville pour je voir un film d'horror.

Le weekend prochain je suis allé au cinéma
en ville où je vois un film d'horror.

21. Provided the other information in a task is correct, a task is acceptably completed when it contains a verb that indicates an appropriate tense...

Q1t2 *J'ai mangez/manger un pizza...*

Je mangé un sandwich...

Q2t1 *Je suis travaillé dans un bureau...*

J'aimer les personnes...

J'ai allé à un école...

Je répondant au telephone

22. Future time frames or time references are acceptable in a variety of forms...*J'irai en vacances.**J'irais en vacances**Demain je sors avec Aline.**q2, t4 En septembre je vais en Espagne.**Je voudrais/vais travailler chez mon oncle.**J'espère/ai l'intention de visiter l'Italie.**J'espère visité l'Italie**Je sors avec Aline, ma petite-amie.**Je vais en Espagne en voiture.**Je voudrais travaille chez mon oncle.***23. An important element in the Communication criteria (top band) is the Candidate's ability to express an opinion.**

Opinions, like Tasks, can be classified. The Examiner places a letter "O" in the right-hand margin and, as before, "O+" would represent a fuller, more complex opinion, e.g. Q2t2: *A mon avis, c'était tres utile*. But the other classifications are different in that "O" represents successful communication and "O-", unsuccessful...

**SUCCESSFUL
COMMUNICATION**Q1t2 *C'était trop froid.*Q2t2 *Je n'ai aimé pas le patron.*Q1t2 *J'ai bu un tres bon coca.***ATTEMPTED BUT UNSUCCESSFUL
COMMUNICATION***J'amie le vin bien...**Le gens c'est brabants***QUALITY****24. A vital element in the Quality criteria is the Candidate's ability to use verb tense.**

In order to qualify for the top band (5-6 marks) the Candidate must include at least one **correct** example of each of the three time frames: past, present and future.

THE CANDIDATE WHO DOES NOT DO THIS MAY NOT SCORE MORE THAN 4 MARKS FOR "QUALITY". This hurdle does *not* also apply to the Candidate's score in "Communication".

Tenses are classified in the same way as Opinions (See 22 above): the Examiner places "P", "P-", "F" or "F-" in the right-hand margin...

SUCCESSFULQ1t1 *Samedi dernier je suis allé...*Q2t4 *Je vais visiter...***ATTEMPTED BUT
UNSUCCESSFUL***Samedi dernier je suis alle...**Samedi dernier j'allais...**Je vais visité*

NOTE that such examples may be acceptable for **Communication** (see 20 and 21 above) but they are not correct, and so are not successful in terms of the **Quality** criteria.

SECTION 3

The Examiner further annotates scripts in the right-hand margin to record other features relevant to "Quality". These are a guide when choosing the appropriate mark-band for a piece of work. Some effective, acceptable examples are...

25. **C - Subordinate clause. This is where the Candidate uses clauses introduced by words such as ...**
Quand, qui, où, pendant que, tandis que, puisque, ce que...etc.
26. **J - Justification. The Candidate explains the reason for an opinion, feeling or point of view...**
*Je n'ai pas aimé mon stage parce que/car j'ai dû me lever trop tôt.
Les gens n'étaient pas sympas, alors je ne voudrais pas y retourner*
27. **L - "Lovely" lexical item. The Candidate relevantly uses a word which is effective and out of the ordinary.**
28. **T - Tense. The Candidate shows the ability to employ more complex tense usage...**
*J'ai vu que j'avais perdu ma montre...
Mes parents ont dit qu'ils n'étaient pas contents...
Il faisait chaud, alors on est allé à la plage...
Il faut que j'aille...*
29. **V - Verbal construction. The Candidate uses more than the simple form of the verb...**
*Je ne peux pas trouver...
Elle attendait depuis dix minutes...
Après avoir décidé, ...*

Report on the Units

June 2005

REPORT TO CENTRES

INTRODUCTION

The examination of the OCR Specification for GCSE French was taken by some 4,000 fewer candidates this year than in 2004. This reduction in candidature was anticipated because of the trend in some centres to make MFL optional in KS4 and disapplying some, in particular, lower ability candidates.

Examiners were pleased, nevertheless, to observe a full range of excellent performances by candidates at all levels and in all components of the examination this year, testimony to the hard work of many teachers in preparing their students.

The level of difficulty of the papers was considered appropriate and allowed candidates the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and ability.

For the most part candidates and their centres chose the appropriate tier of entry in each skill, which enabled individuals to perform to the best of their ability. In Listening, however, there were cases of candidates taking Foundation who could have benefited from taking Higher. In Reading, conversely, there were quite a lot of ill-advised attempts at the Higher Tier.

Although heartened by many very good performances, examiners have commented this year on a perceived increase in cases of poor presentation. Markers make every effort to decipher poor handwriting but sometimes it is difficult to determine a candidate's intentions. In Listening and Reading comprehension for example, many exercises are completed by choosing and writing a letter. Candidates should be reminded that they should copy letters clearly in upper case and that any changes should be made unambiguously. Over-writing is never satisfactory. Some candidates also need reminding that examinations should be completed using blue or black ink (not pencil) and that "Tippex" should not be used. It is disappointing to observe that some candidates seem to devote more care to the graffiti they add to their papers than to the answers themselves. Regrettably, there were some examples of insulting or scurrilous language written on examination papers. These cases are referred to Special Consideration, as such a practice puts candidates' exam results at risk.

The option of written coursework continues to be a very popular one with centres. To ensure maximum benefit to their candidates, centres must be aware of the requirements for this component. The detailed report on the coursework component which follows should be regarded as essential reading for all centres involved in or contemplating taking on this option.

The remainder of this report consists of more detailed feed-back to centres on the individual components, as well as a statement of statistical results. The information offered is intended to benefit teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations.

GCSE FRENCH LISTENING (2351/01/02) 2005

General Comments

This year's French Listening examination was widely accessible to candidates at both Foundation and Higher tiers. Marks were higher than last year mainly because Section 2, which is common to both tiers, was found to be easier than the equivalent section last year. Although few maximum marks were recorded at either tier, very low marks (below 10 out of 50) were equally rare. This may be due in part to the trend whereby fewer low ability candidates are now entered for MFL examinations, as the subject has in many schools become optional. Some Foundation Tier candidates scoring marks above 40 out of 50 should more appropriately have attempted the Higher Tier paper, allowing them access to higher UMS marks. Examiners appreciated the fact that few candidates had decided at the last moment to change their tier of entry. Centres are reminded that OCR will send invoices for late changes.

Candidates respected the rubrics well and there were far fewer cases of exercises being answered in the wrong language than has been the case in previous years. This is due in no small way to the fact that Centres are clearly coaching candidates well in how to make use of the five minute reading time. At the same time, though, examiners frequently found handwriting to be poor, particularly in those exercises in which candidates indicate their choice by selecting a particular letter. Candidates should be reminded to copy such letters in upper case, just as they are printed on the paper and to make sure that all their answers and any changes are legible.

SECTION 1 (FOUNDATION TIER)

Exercise 1. As is normally the case, marks were high on this simple opening exercise. All candidates were successful on the opening two questions. The figure on Q4 was usually correct as was the comprehension of *église* on Q5. Fairly large numbers, however, failed to pick the correct direction (*à gauche*) on Q3; this may have been as much through right/left confusion as through failure to understand the French.

Exercise 2: This exercise tested comprehension of school subjects and was generally well answered except for *chimie* (Q10) and, on occasion, *histoire-géo* (Q9) for which the gymnastics icon was sometimes chosen.

Exercise 3: For the most part, candidates answered this exercise very well, which tested the vocabulary of interests. Most difficulties were encountered on *lecture* (Q13) and, perhaps predictably, *échecs* (Q15). The usual confusion of *natation* and *équitation* also appeared and *bateau* (Q14) was not known as well as one might have expected.

Exercise 4: This exercise was not so well answered, although all candidates were successful on some of the items (usually Q16, Q17 and Q21). Q19, with *viande, boeuf, porc* and *agneau*, was found particularly difficult, most pupils selecting either the cheese shop or the fish shop. The vocabulary in Q20 (*fruits de mer, truite, saumon*) also caused problems but obviously *bonbons* and *chocolats* on Q21 gave candidates an easy final mark.

Exercise 5: There was a small incline of difficulty here, as candidates were for some questions required to show understanding of phrases rather than individual words. Thus, although *sud* (Q22) and *quarante-cinq* (Q24) were picked out with little difficulty, candidates found it more difficult to match *au bord de la mer* with *plage* (Q23) and to pick the closing time from the phrase *ouvert entre dix heures du matin et minuit* (Q25). Only better candidates matched the summer seasons with *l'été* in Q26.

SECTION 2 (FOUNDATION AND HIGHER TIERS)

Candidates performed much better on this section than did candidates for the 2004 exam. Higher Tier candidates, as might be expected, scored very high marks but it was pleasing to see how Foundation Tier candidates scored marks of 14 or 15 out of 20 on this section. The fact that the section was clearly a little easier than in 2004 accounts for the higher grade boundaries this year.

Exercise 1: The opening three questions were generally well answered, though some confused the relations on Q3 where *frère*, *mère* and *tante* were all heard on the recording. The latter two questions were more demanding as the language was a little more complex and, as often at this level, candidates were required to distinguish the negative in Q5 (*pas cher...pas comme à Paris*). Teachers are advised to give students training in gist comprehension and the ability to detect negatives.

Exercise 2: This exercise was very well answered by all candidates. On Q.9, answer C was picked sometimes instead of D but maximum marks here were common. Examiners were pleased to report that there was no evidence that candidates were “fazed” by the deliberate fade-in and fade-out of the television advertisements, intended to add a touch of realism to the exercise. Candidates realised that the critical information was given during the “full volume” section of each clip. Obviously, candidates have been well trained with the use of past papers in which the sound effect of “radio broadcasts” or “telephone messages” has helped to attune their ears.

Exercise 3: Here candidates were required to give brief answers in French, though they should be reminded that it is perfectly acceptable, and indeed preferable, for them to answer questions such as Q12 (asking for the dates of the reservation) by using figures rather than words. On Q.11 several spellings of *montagne* were acceptable, but correct renderings had to start with *mont-* followed by a nasal sound. Q13 was usually well answered (spellings such as *infants* and *adults* were accepted as they would be understood by a French person) but in a fair number of cases, because of the liaison heard, *deux adultes* was rendered as “12 adults” or *trois enfants* as “13 children”. Some candidates assumed answers had to be written in the spaces at Q14(a). Few wrote acceptable renderings of *machine à laver* at Q14(b). Comprehensible renderings such as *machine lave*, *machine a lavais* or *machine de lave* were accepted whereas misleading or nonsensical concepts such as *machine à lever* or *machine la vais* were not.

Exercise 4: This exercise tested the ability to understand how the speakers related to different members of their family. Such gist comprehension exercises usually feature in this section of the exam and teachers are advised to give candidates plenty of practice in tests of this type. Higher Tier candidates usually answered well but the majority of Foundation Tier candidates found the exercise rather difficult and it would appear that they often guessed answers. Q20 was the most demanding, as there was a need to distinguish between the imperfect and present tenses. Q15 and Q17 were usually answered correctly.

SECTION 3 (HIGHER TIER)

Exercise 1: This opening exercise was a fairly demanding test of gist comprehension. Although all candidates managed to score, maximum marks were comparatively rare. Typical patterns of answers were correct answers for Q.1,2,3, and 7 and with Q.5, 6, and 8 the weakest or a poor start on Q1-3 followed by correct answers for the later questions. Answers J and B were often reversed on Q.6 and 8.

Exercise 2: This was the one exercise in which answers in French were required, although in all cases single words were sufficient. It was perhaps surprising that not more candidates were able to pick out *vendredi* on Q9; not all realised that it was simply the day that was required and others attempted to transliterate and produced meaningless answers such as *vendre dix*. On Q10 many candidates failed to recognise the negative in *pas dans le parc* and thereby did not score as any reference to the park (other than in a negative context) resulted in the loss of the mark. Most candidates successfully offered *moto* on Q11, though it should be noted that “motor” or *moteur* were rejected whereas phonetically correct renderings such as *motto* or *mauto* were acceptable. Q12 proved to be difficult, only the best students realising that a simple verb such as *finir* or *termine* was all that was required. Some simply offered *jusqu’à* which was not accepted. *Dure* on its own, however, was acceptable. Again on Q13 it was only the best candidates who realised that it was simply a question of placing *plus* in front of *intéressant* to show comprehension of *mieux qu’une soirée... Plus* was the only correct answer here although, as is always the case with answers in French, phonetically similar renderings such as *plu*, *plue* or *plut* were acceptable. The most common incorrect answer here was *très*.

Exercise 3: This multiple-choice exercise based on the life of the footballer Fabien Barthez, was again suitably demanding, but was answered reasonably well, with the top grade candidates scoring full marks. Most understood the year at Q14; Q15 posed few problems as the key phrase *tous les sports*, although surrounded by mention of football and rugby, was given in the recording. On Q16 candidates had to link *quelques années de moins que lui* in the recording with *plus jeune* on the paper – a good differentiator of the more able candidates. Q17 was found difficult because of vocabulary such as *a détruit notre canapé* (text) and *a cassé un meuble* (question paper), another fairly demanding test. Q18 and Q19 were both found easier and were well answered. Q20 was a test of the vocabulary of emotions and the ability to draw conclusions and was correctly answered by the better candidates.

Exercise 4: The vast majority of candidates followed the rubric correctly and ticked the requisite number of boxes. This was a testing exercise requiring careful listening, thus full marks were fairly rare, though nearly all had at least 2 correct answers. Alternatives (c) and (j) were the most often correct.

Exercise 5: This final exercise was a test for A and A* candidates. Many showed fairly good understanding of the item about a pilot joking that he had a bomb concealed in his shoe, but answers were often guessed or were imprecise. On Q.22, either “pilot” or “co-pilot” were acceptable but the most common incorrect answer, because of the reference to the airport of the same name, was “John F. Kennedy”. On Q23 candidates were required to give the full concept of a bomb being hidden in his shoe: not many candidates did, usually giving a wrong place (e.g. “airport” or “plane”) or altogether missing the detail of the location. Most picked out the idea of imprisonment on Q24, but the length of the penalty was also required for the mark. Teachers are advised to teach their candidates to give full answers for this final English exercise. Q25 was often invalidated by rendering *a examiné à fond l’avion* as “checking him” or “the pilot” or “the

airport". The final question was a test of the verb *annuler*, a word which is obviously known only by the best candidates but which it is felt reasonable to test at this stage of the test. Rendering of the verb as "postponed" or "delayed" in an answer such as "the flight was postponed/delayed" was rejected, but answers such as "they were delayed", "they had to wait" or even "they were late" were acceptable as *they* referred to "passengers", the subject of the question.

2352/01 and 02

SPEAKING – External Assessment

Teachers in centres had prepared their candidates extremely well, the majority of the candidates tackling the role-plays with confidence. They were able to show their knowledge in a variety of topics in the Presentation section of the Speaking Test.

This year saw continuing good practice in many Centres. In role-play 1 and role-play 2, candidates were “nudged” for elucidation (see page 9 of the Teachers’ Instructions) and were able to achieve full marks. It would be advantageous to candidates that teachers extend this good practice in Centres.

In the vast majority of Centres, teachers adhered to the written prompts in the Teachers’ Booklet. In some Centres, teachers re-phrased these prompts, making the task more accessible and in such cases (the prompts being mandatory in substance) the full two marks could not be awarded.

In the General Conversation section there were some excellent examples of good practice. Teacher/examiners used closed questions to begin the topic and more open questions as the candidate progressed. Where teachers use a departmental bank of questions, care should be taken that the order of the questions does not become so predictable that the candidates know which question they will have next.

Centres are reminded that the quality of recording is absolutely crucial in the marking of the candidates. Teacher/examiners should take care, even going to the extent of pre-testing the machinery when selecting the equipment used to record the Speaking Tests. Cassette recorders with a built-in microphone may not produce the best recordings, especially when the recording volume is so high that the sound is distorted.

Cassettes and mark sheets were securely packaged and were usually sent to the external examiner in the order of recording. This was invaluable to the external examiner, who was able to identify candidates and teaching groups quickly and efficiently.

Centres are asked to make special note that the cassettes for Foundation and Higher Tier recordings (for all languages) should be placed in separate bags each with the appropriate address label even though both Foundation and Higher might be going to the one examiner.

Section 1 Rôle Plays

External examiners thought that the cards were balanced, but each may have had its own area of difficulty. Centres are reminded that it is permissible to “nudge for elucidation” if the candidate’s pronunciation is so poor as to obscure communication.

In Card 1, candidates used the suggestions made on the Candidate’s card for task 1 and generally were able to use *je voudrais* correctly. In task 2, some candidates were unable to communicate **500**; in task 3, there was a significant number of candidates who found the concept of *sac/sachet* too difficult. The final task was well executed.

Card 2 had its own area of difficulty. Surprisingly it was the first task which caused the most problem, as lack of knowledge and poor pronunciation hampered the candidates. The next two tasks were handled extremely well; the final task, competently handled.

Card 3 brought forth an issue of pronunciation. The first task saw some anglicised pronunciation of *ticket/billet* but the next task was usually competently handled. There was some confusion over the number in task 3, many candidates opting for *six*. It was here that some skilful nudging allowed the candidate to score full marks. The final task proved to be accessible to the majority of candidates.

Card 4 again became an issue of pronunciation in some tasks. There was anglicised pronunciation of *sandwich* in the first task and of *toilette(s)* in the final task. The other two tasks were competently answered, with the full range of suggestions on the candidates' card being adopted.

Card 5: The pronunciation of *glace* proved to be a hurdle to only a minority of candidates, but the flavour required in task 2 proved to be very accessible. There was some confusion among the candidates over the pronunciation of *eau* in task 3, though asking the cost was accessible.

Card 6: The first two tasks were well communicated with candidates using a variety of items of fruit. The concept of *crisps* in task 3 was not handled well, with many Foundation candidates unable to communicate it or resorting to English. The final task was found accessible.

In Card 7, candidates found the first task difficult, being unable to communicate the idea of *timbre* and resorting to English. However, the remaining three tasks were competently handled, especially the countries mentioned in task 3.

In card 8 some candidates struggled with the pronunciation of *pain* but the vast majority could ask for a type of loaf and used the suggestions provided. Task 3 was seen as a major hurdle for the candidates, with only the most able succeeding here.

Section 2 Rôle Plays

External examiners thought that these cards, too, were balanced and fair, although each brought its own difficulty.

In Card 1, there was some confusion over the concept of *chèques de voyage* but the majority of candidates were able to state an amount in task 2. The past tense proved to be difficult for some candidates but the majority coped well with the open question in task 4. Some Teacher/examiners changed the prompt here (see remarks above on loss of full marks) and this made the task more accessible.

In card two, some candidates produced an anglicised pronunciation of *réservation* but the vast majority of candidates were able to produce a correct answer for task 2. In task three, many candidates could not communicate the idea of *attendre* but were able to use *je voudrais rester (ici)* as a valid substitute. The final task was competently handled.

The first task in Card 3 produced a whole range of correct interpretations and it was pleasing to hear candidates using their imagination. In the second task, some candidates struggled with the required negative; and in the third, some used inappropriate verbs for their age or their nationality. The final task proved to be accessible.

In Card 4, the majority of candidates were able to cope with the first three tasks, despite some anglicised pronunciation, of *coton* in particular. The size given tended to be the English equivalent and this was accepted for full marks. A significant number of candidates found the final task quite difficult with some poor pronunciation of *carte de crédit*. Some candidates found the concept of *je voudrais payer* quite challenging.

The first task on Card 5 was answered well, with many candidates able to pronounce *hier* very well. In the second task, candidates often omitted a verb or failed to mention the room. The third task was extremely well handled and there were some ingenious attempts in response to task 4.

The first task on Card 6 caused problems for some candidates as they were unable to communicate the concept of **not having made a reservation**. However, the next two tasks were competently handled by the majority of candidates and the final task was well answered.

In Card 7 there was frequently an anglicised pronunciation of *guide* but it was task 2 which caused most problems and only the most able could communicate this concept accurately. The remaining two tasks were clearly communicated by the majority of candidates.

The first task on Card 8 proved to be challenging, with many candidates unable to communicate the notion of *j'ai perdu*. In the next task, nationalities proved to be difficult but the final two tasks proved to be extremely accessible.

Section 3 Rôle Plays

There were many excellent accounts given by candidates this year, with the majority well-practised in the use of the perfect tense. The good practice of treating this section of the exam as a role-play has continued, with few monologues. It is still worth mentioning that Teacher/examiners should not interrupt in order to correct the candidate's French as it usually impedes the flow and concentration of the candidate.

It was pleasing to hear candidates giving reasons and justifications without having to be prompted by the Teacher/examiner.

Booklet 1 proved to be accessible to the majority of candidates although some found the concept of working abroad quite challenging. Some candidates found forming the past tense of *ouvrir* quite difficult and the pronunciation of *rencontrer* was challenging for others. The final two sections of the card were competently handled and dealt with some common notions.

Booklet 2 proved to be accessible. Where candidates followed the headings of each section, there were some excellent accounts. The first two sections proved to be very accessible but the ideas of *se promener le long de la Seine* and *mettre les cadeaux sous l'arbre* caused some confusion. While *ouvrir* caused some candidates to stumble, the majority were able to describe presents they had given and received.

Booklet 3: candidates built their confidence quickly with the account of the journey to the port and activities aboard the boat. Candidates felt confident in the third section, stating their impressions and reasons. There was some confusion over *descendre du bateau* in the fourth section, but the final section proved to be very accessible and candidates gave some very good accounts.

Booklet 4 proved to be very accessible with candidates offering some excellent descriptions of the day's activities. Some found the notion of *s'arrêter à une station-service* difficult; others found *faire la visite d'une cave* similarly difficult. The activities in the final two sections were competently handled.

The suggestions in Booklet 5 produced some excellent accounts, although the concept of *admirer les beaux arbres* proved to be too difficult for some. The final two sections of this Booklet produced some excellent accounts and some heart-felt opinions.

Some of the vocabulary in Booklet 6 may have been unfamiliar to some candidates, but there were still some very good accounts of the day. The one word *baptême* was glossed on the card to ensure candidates understood the context, and the activities of the day were competently described. Details of the ceremony were not expected beyond what appeared on the Booklet.

Booklet 7 was handled extremely well, with some very good accounts covering the first three sections of the narrative. Some candidates found the fourth section challenging, although many were able to add some detail to the account. The final section of this card proved to be very accessible.

Booklet 8 produced some excellent accounts of a day during the holiday, with candidates adding imaginative detail to the activities in the first three sections. The final two sections of this card also encouraged some good accounts but some found *dormir un peu* difficult to communicate.

Presentation

There is clear evidence of excellent practice in the majority of Centres. It is clear that candidates have chosen a topic that they WANT to speak about and that they have taken the time to research and learn their topic.

There was clear evidence of the correct use of the cue card and this *aide-mémoire* allowed some weaker candidates to score a respectable mark. Where candidates rushed through their presentation, the pronunciation and intonation suffered. Teacher/examiners should not hesitate to slow the candidate down if it is obvious that the candidate's performance is suffering in their haste to deliver the presentation.

The very best presentations featured not only control in the delivery and preparation, but also the regular use of opinions and justifications (refer to the mark scheme pertaining to the Presentation). Candidates should be encouraged in this section to express several opinions and then to justify those opinions, using a variety of linguistic structures, in order to gain the higher marks.

Discussion and General Conversation

It was encouraging to see that Teacher/examiners were selecting the correct two topics from the four offered in the booklet. While it was not a common error, one of the most frequent comments from external examiners concerned candidates who were disadvantaged when only one topic of conversation was covered. OCR wishes to remind teachers that candidates are not compensated for any part of the examination which is omitted due to teacher error (refer to the Specification).

The discussion of the candidate's presentation should last for approximately two minutes (Teachers' Booklet page 5). In some Centres the discussion consisted of only one question and answer, lasting far less time than the two minutes required. As Teacher/examiners would know the chosen topic in advance, six or seven questions can be prepared before the speaking test, but these questions must remain unknown to the candidates.

The good practice of starting with "closed" questioning and progressing to "open ended" questioning was obvious in the majority of Centres. In this way candidates grew in confidence and were able to achieve their potential. It was good to hear Teacher/examiners in some Centres using questions from a bank available in the department. However, Teacher/examiners should not fall into the trap of using exactly the same questions in exactly the same order with all the candidates.

It is very encouraging to hear teachers' skilful examining of candidates which encourage responses using past, present and future tenses. As this is a key criterion, it opens access to the higher mark range in the quality of language mark; candidates are advantaged by this skilful examining.

2353: Reading

GENERAL COMMENTS

The examination proved to be a fair test for candidates at both tiers. The papers contained the range of topics, text styles and test types that have become familiar features of papers. The vocabulary expected from candidates was determined by the defined content lists of words and structures published in conjunction with the specification.

Candidates appeared to have had ample time to complete the papers. Rubric infringements were rare.

Candidates appeared generally to have been well prepared for the examination though examiners felt that this year a larger number had been inappropriately entered for the Higher Tier.

SECTION ONE

Exercise 1 Questions 1-5.

These opening questions followed the established format by requiring the identification of discrete items of vocabulary. This selection proved to be quite straightforward. Even Question 1 (*PISCINE*) was almost always answered correctly, as should be expected. In question 2, the time was usually correctly identified. In question 3 *fraises* and *framboises* were sometimes confused though *poires* was selected by more than a few. In question 4 it was disappointing to note that a day of the week was unrecognisable to some. Question 5 was generally answered correctly.

Exercise 2 Questions 6-12

School items are a familiar topic and the only vocabulary item to be a stumbling block was *cartable* (Q6).

Exercise 3 Question 13

Most candidates scored well here though some were confused between *un paquet de beurre* and *un paquet de sucre* and between *pommes* and *pommes de terre*.

Exercise 4 Questions 14-16 This exercise was generally accessible to the majority of candidates. Question 14 was sometimes wrong in spite of the fact that the text made no mention of any means of transport other than aeroplane. The mention of *aéroport* was a further clue. In question 16 there was a minority of candidates who failed to recognise the number *dix-huit* in the text.

Exercise 5 Questions 17-22

This exercise proved to be quite difficult. It may be that the topic of train travel has been neglected. Similar tasks have appeared on past GCSE papers and have usually been very well handled by candidates. For many this year, however, making a connection between *j'ai faim* and the related *Cafétéria* was not possible. Even linking *Magasin* and *acheter* proved beyond many. Not surprisingly, therefore, more specific "railway station" vocabulary such as *horaire*, *guichet* and *consigne* proved to be stumbling blocks for many.

Exercise 6 Questions 23-27

The majority of candidates scored some marks here. The only difficulty seemed to be *vivent* in question 24 and this stood in the way of full marks for many candidates.

SECTION TWO

Exercise 1 Questions 1-6

Foundation candidates usually scored at least 2 marks on this opening exercise as there were few zero scores. Many Higher Tier candidates scored full marks. Candidates need to be able to cope with longer texts at this level and to have an understanding of verb constructions. In Question 1 *une planche* was the tempting choice for many candidates. Question 2 was the only mark obtained by some. The majority of candidates could copy their choices with sufficient accuracy for them to be recognisable.

Exercise 2 Questions 7-13

Though the French was all at an accessible level, this exercise tested the commitment of many Foundation Tier candidates. There was quite a lot of French to read and candidates who persevered were rewarded by good scores.

Exercise 3 Questions 14-18

This exercise also proved testing, with low scores common for Foundation candidates. Some seem to panic at the sight of a longer text and a task such as this. For more than a few there seemed to be no comprehension of the fact that this piece was about a *place* called Dijon, containing reference to a *person* called Gustave Eiffel. A small number of candidates at Foundation Tier did not answer this exercise, perhaps as a result of failing to turn to the back page. A few answered in the wrong language, though this was rare.

Q14 Many candidates seem to reject common sense at the sight of a number. *Deux cent mille* was very often conveyed as “200 million”, though examiners observed virtually any number between “two” and “250 thousand million”. Odd expressions such as “ten hundred” and “moderate” also figured as answers.

Q15 Clearly *Gustave Eiffel y est né* was beyond many. Some put the Eiffel Tower in Dijon.

Q16 Often correct.

Q17 Very often the French word *moutarde* was written, but not accepted. Variations on the spelling of “mustard” were accepted by the mark scheme.

Q18 Often correct, though many candidates struggled with the English spelling of “appreciate”.

SECTION THREE

Exercise 1 Questions 1-6

Candidates did reasonably well on this opening exercise, and examiners were very tolerant of tortured French, which nevertheless conveyed comprehension. Many ignored the *pour* in question 1, which was intended to help candidates supply an infinitive or noun phrase.

Q2 Quite a number answered only *where he worked* and not *what his job was*.

The final two multi-choice questions were sometimes the only score for weaker candidates.

Exercise 2 Questions 7-14

As expected, such an exercise is demanding, though better candidates had no trouble in scoring full marks. It was pleasing to see many high scores though weaker candidates clearly resorted to guesswork. It was also encouraging that some candidates, though wrongly inserting *moins* in Q10 and *longue* in Q14, were exhibiting some comprehension of the sentences.

Q8 proved the most difficult (*poids*)

prier was a frequent wrong choice for Q9.

Exercise 3 Questions 15-24

As expected, this was a discriminating exercise and it was pleasing to see so many candidates responding to the challenge.

Exercise 4 Questions 25-28

This short piece proved difficult for all but the best.

Q25 The numbers again sowed panic and despair! The inattentive candidates produced "2002"; the uncomprehending "1960"; the arithmetically inclined candidates offered 1942; and some others "60 years ago in 2002".

Q26 The meaning of *place* was a stumbling block.

Q27 The meaning of *début* was often omitted. Some thought Giverny to be another artist, mistranslating *à* as "and" and there was frequent distortion involving "celebrity" and "celebrating".

Q28. The most frequent answer was "to continue to run the camp site". *Améliorer* was either ignored or unknown.

2354 GCSE French Writing June 2005

Examiners were in agreement that the papers at each tier offered candidates a fair opportunity to show what they knew and could do and that the level of difficulty of the examination was in line with that of previous years.

There were some adverse comments about poor presentation skills; unparagraphed, rambling answers; untidy crossing out; and an apparent lack of regard for the importance of the task in hand. Whilst some crossing out is inevitable in the stress of an examination, it is disappointing to note the frequency of such comments.

By contrast, there was some evidence of good practice in the preparation of candidates. In Sections 2 and 3, those who had been trained to respond to each of the four tasks by writing a separate paragraph, often responded more succinctly, focusing on the specific details required and tending to gain better marks for communication.

Section 1 Question 1

The function of this question is to provide students with a platform for success in later exercises. It is unlikely that a grade will ever be awarded on the basis of success in this question alone. Examiners reported that the vast majority were able to complete the list; however, it is disappointing to note that after five years of study there are some candidates who are unable or do not wish to offer 8 individual words.

Any places which one might go to on holiday were accepted, whether or not the word was represented in the illustrations.

English words e.g. **park**, **stadium**, were not rewarded. Similarly rejected were activities e.g. **natation**, **courses**.

Question 2

As has been the practice with this exercise in the past, any words which might reasonably relate to the pictures were accepted. English words were rejected as a matter of course. Where verbs were required, past participles and infinitives were rewarded with one mark; correctly conjugated verbs in any tense were also given a bonus, as were all nouns which were accurately written.

Common errors included:

- 1 *fais*
- 2 *t-shirt, jean*
- 3 *match*
- 4 *park*
- 5 *livre*
- 6 *librairie*

The following answers were considered appropriate:

- 1 *vais, danse, chante, joue, visite.*
- 2 *copine / copain, amie / ami, sœur / frère, mère / père.*
- 3 *joue, vais, pratique.*
- 4 *parc, jardin public.*
- 5 *fais, regarde, lis, finis, complète, déteste, aime, travaille.*
- 6 *salon, séjour, bureau, chambre, bibliothèque, cuisine.*

Question 3

It is with some success in this question that candidates confirm a grade F. Each of the six responses carried 1 mark for Communication; the subsequent award for Quality of Language reflected the success or otherwise in writing a complete sentence. It is expected at this level that students can produce a simple sentence, although as the mark scheme indicates marks are awarded for note form. Some candidates responded as if the English stimulus were a question, thus producing simple phrases e.g. **seize ans, à Leamington, petit, amusant** etc.

The most frequent error surrounded the confusion of *avoir* and *être*, both in their various spellings and uses. Some candidates found the information familiar from Speaking tasks, however the general level of spelling and grammatical accuracy was at times quite poor. Although the exercise was clearly anchored in the third person, the use of *je / mon* was quite common.

- 1 Too many missed the fact that name and age were required. Spelling of *s'appelle* whilst recognisable was generally poor, as were attempts at *quinze / seize ans*. Forms of *être* were common in the expression of age.
- 2 Various spellings of *habiter* were accepted for Communication, including *abite, habbite*.
- 3 Any one of a whole range of simple details about the person's appearance was acceptable. Predictably, attempts at *cheveux* were often rejected as they had more in common with *chevaux*. When candidates used adjectives, they rarely made the necessary agreements e.g. *yeux bleu*, however this did not affect the mark.
- 4 A single adjective describing character was sufficient to gain one mark; many seemed at a loss for a suitable word: *ennuyeux* was very frequently given.
- 5 Any reference to the person's family was accepted. Responses ranged from a list of family members to details of their names and ages and even comments about individuals; *ennuyeux* in various incorrect spellings featured again.
- 6 Many attempted a full sentence, although the verb was often an infinitive or past participle.

Section 2

Candidates favoured Question 1 by a very large margin. Perhaps they felt reassured as they recognized a familiar situation and therefore did not take the trouble to look at the second option which provided just as good an opportunity to show what they knew.

At this level, examiners are looking for evidence of competence using the past and future tenses and for the ability to express an opinion, as these are the features required for the award of grade C. It is worth focusing on the published mark scheme which describes the performance expected for the top award of six marks for Quality of Language in this section:

Limited range of vocabulary, idiom and structure.

Appropriate register

The style of writing is basic but reasonably coherent.

Past, present and future tenses used at a basic level.

Many Higher Tier candidates performed very well, gaining full marks with ease. However, they should make certain that they respond simply to each of the four tasks.

Centres are again advised to encourage their able students to confine themselves to giving the details required by writing about 100 words, as stated by the rubric. Many abler candidates produced over-long answers using a whole range of complex structures, which are not rewarded in Section 2. They should reserve the full range of their linguistic knowledge for Section 3. Candidates who write beyond the word limit do not do themselves any favour, nor are they likely to score any more marks than if they had very carefully and succinctly answered the tasks within the set word limit. Candidates should aim to devote about 25 words to each of the 4 tasks, to ensure equal treatment, thereby enabling them to gain access to the highest marks for communication.

There were many Foundation Tier candidates who, whilst not gaining full marks, achieved good scores here, demonstrating that they knew and could use the three critical elements for a grade C performance. Examiners did note a common error in expressing the perfect tense amongst these candidates ... *j'aime mangé / j'aime visité* for *j'ai mangé / j'ai visité*.

Question 1

The illustrations were intended to give candidates an idea of a restaurant/type of cuisine. Many thought that they should write about a visit to a restaurant in that country. This did not affect the mark for Communication.

In the first task, candidates were expected to write a simple sentence referring to where and when they ate. Very common errors included misspelling of *restaurant*, *anniversaire* and attempts at the genitive structure *l'anniversaire de ma mère*: too many produced phrases such as *ma mère's anniversaire*.

For the second task, candidates were invited to mention what they ate/drank and to give their opinion of it. It was disappointing to note how many were not able to write the past tense of *manger* correctly, *je mangé* and *j'ai mange* (no accent) were very frequent; candidates had more success with *j'ai bu*. Most opinions were expressed simply e.g. *c'était bon / bien / super / délicieux*. There were many who produced misspelled variations of the English 'delicious' and examiners wondered why they had chosen to do this rather than use a more familiar word.

A further opportunity to use the past tense was provided by the third task. Most picked up on the suggestions provided, in some cases mentioning all three. For Communication marks, mention of one activity was sufficient. There was again much variety in the presentation of the perfect tense verb, especially among Foundation Tier candidates, e.g. *je retourné / j'ai allé / je visité / je suis dansé*. The performance of Higher Tier candidates was more consistently accurate.

In the final task candidates had to use a future time frame to express their plans for the following weekend. For Communication marks, a present tense verb with a future time reference such as *à l'avenir / le week-end prochain* was sufficient. However, it should be noted that the Quality of Language marks expect a future verb e.g. *je vais aller / j'irai*. Not to provide a future verb means that this mark is limited to 4 out of 6; it is Higher Tier candidates who most miss out, as they tend to experiment with other structures.

Question 2

Examiners were disappointed at not seeing more answers to this question. It provided a similar structure of tasks. Nonetheless, there was a good level achievement among those who did attempt it.

In the first task, candidates were asked to state when and where they did their work experience. Most could do this effectively, although there was some poor spelling of *travailler* e.g. *traviller* / *travialler* and, as with Question 1, there were some inadequate forms of the perfect tense e.g. *je travaillé* / *j'ai travaille* (no accent).

Mirroring the second task in Question 1, candidates had then to mention what they did and to pass their opinion on it. There were some proficient responses to this and candidates clearly felt comfortable with the information. Higher Tier candidates often made more of this than was necessary.

An expression of the future was required in answer to the third task. Most were able to convey at least partially what they might do in the summer, using the suggestions provided. Success at expressing the future varied considerably : e.g. *j'ai visiter* / *j'ai visiterai* / *j'ai vais visiter* / *j'ai voudrais visiter* / *je visiteria* / *je vais visité*. However, there were many who could offer a correct version.

The future was again needed in the final task and similar errors occurred in the structure of the verb.

Section 3

Examiners reported much success in this part of the examination. Greater security in handling verb forms and confidence in using a variety of structures remain the hallmark of the performance of candidates at the top of the range. Among middle-ranking candidates, there appears to be a degree of carefulness but a lack of ambition in terms of the structures used. The published mark scheme is helpful in guiding both teachers and students.

For Communication, 7/8 marks may be awarded if the candidate *communicates and justifies ideas and points of view, communicates in longer sequences, provides descriptions*; for Quality of Language, 9 – 11 marks may be awarded if there is evidence of *longer sequences of language using a range of clause types, verb tenses used with confidence* and the work is *fluent and consistent with a degree of control*. Examiners are looking for subordinate clauses using *quand, où, qui, que, si, pendant que* ; other features might include the present participle, the perfect infinitive, object pronouns, appropriate use of *depuis, venir de ...* .

Besides security of verb forms and a range of structures, examiners are looking for competence in expressing and justifying opinions. To do this effectively, candidates must be prepared to express themselves other than in language which is typical of Section 2 i.e. *c'était bien* / *super* etc. More appropriate would be *je pense que ...* / *je trouve que ...* / *à mon avis, ...* and more informative adjectives e.g. *fascinant* / *magnifique* / *passionnant*.

Question 1

This was by far the most popular choice. Perhaps the reference to holidays drew the interest of candidates. Unfortunately, despite the number of clues on the question paper, there was a significant proportion of students who either did not notice or misunderstood the reference to being on holiday without parents. Even amongst those who did register the import of this, there were some who wrote *n'avec pas les parents*.

Candidates initially had to establish the destination and the timing of their holiday. This was quite well done by the vast majority; however some appear not to think fully about what they wish to write: statements such as *le week-end dernier, j'ai passé deux semaines en Espagne ...* were rather frequent.

In the second task, it was necessary to mention what they did and to give impressions and the reasons for these. Not all candidates responded to all the parts. Some wrote in a little too much detail of all the activities undertaken.

This was the most challenging task and despite the obvious difficulties, many candidates had an appreciation of language which was flexible enough for them to express their feelings. Both positive and negative were required for the task to be completed e.g. *sans mes parents, j'ai plus de liberté / d'indépendance ... sans mes parents, je n'avais pas assez d'argent ... sans mes parents, je pouvais rester au lit jusqu'à midi ... avec mes parents, ma mère fait la cuisine ... / mes parents paient tout ... / on va au restaurant tous les soirs*.

In the final task candidates were generally able to identify a destination of choice, though some lost marks for Communication for not explaining why they would go there. Again, examiners hope to see more sophisticated expression of the reasons why.

Question 2

A small number of students opted for this question. Unfortunately, the sight of the word *accident* spawned a number of road-traffic accidents which occurred before or after the party. Such responses were not penalised, however the expectation was of mishaps opening bottles, falling down stairs or into swimming pools, or the like.

The first paragraph often referred extensively to preparations for the party, these were acceptable as were the descriptions of guests, presents and party games.

The third task reflected the same task in Question 1 and candidates encountered similar problems. Examiners felt that candidates handled the issues more successfully. Common amongst the positives were *c'est moins cher ... / on peut boire de l'alcool ... / on peut inviter tous ses copains ...* The negative points included *les voisins n'étaient pas contents ... / il y avait trop de bruit ... / on a cassé la maison ...*

The invitation to explain plans for their eighteenth birthday was quite well handled, but again the reasons were not always clearly stated. Some however, struggled with the structure *pour mes dix-huit ans ... / quand j'aurai 18 ans ...*

Conclusion

As was noted last year, at some centres candidates are taught set phrases which they might include in their responses. Intrinsicly there is nothing wrong with this, However the onus is on the candidate to use these items of language in an appropriate and logical context. Too often such phrases/sentences are noticeable because they do not fit in with the rest of the narrative or they contrast with the general level of linguistic competence. *Tout d'un coup il s'est mis à pleuvoir, si j'avais su j'aurais apporté mon parapluie* is an example of such a pre-learnt item; if the rest of the language is not of this standard, then the candidate gains little from using it; equally, if it is simply included with no apparent justification, it becomes a piece of irrelevance.

Fortunately, there are many potentially gifted students who rise to the challenge of writing accurately and in an interesting way.

1925/2355/01/02

Speaking – Internal Assessment

General Comments

As in 2004, Moderators were positive about the standard of work heard and the way in which the Speaking test had been administered in Centres. Candidates had been well prepared for the test and it is again pleasing to report the low incidence of clerical errors which occurred in Centres. Teachers had generally prepared their own rôles well and gave their candidates many opportunities to show what they knew and were able to do. The general standard of the conduct of the tests was very pleasing in the vast majority of Centres and examining teachers increasing familiarity with the marking scheme often ensured that candidates were encouraged to work for the marks by appropriate questioning techniques.

The compilation of samples was very good this year. As outlined in the Teacher/examiner Booklet, the best practice observed was that of choosing a full range of marks to cover the work of different teachers wherever possible. Many Centres did send in edited tapes with candidates in rank order. This proved extremely helpful to Moderators. They also appreciated Centres which sent a brief covering letter explaining the composition of the sample together with the sample mark sheets attached. Regrettably, a handful of Centres sent incorrectly labelled mark sheets and/or cassettes. It is crucial that all work be correctly labelled and identified on the cassettes. A few Centres had incidences of incomplete mark sheets, where topic titles or candidate numbers had occasionally been omitted.

The standard of internal moderation was generally satisfactory in Centres and in some cases it was very professional. New Centres are reminded that they may standardise marking prior to the examination by using the teacher booklet, or they may wish to cross-moderate after the examination and adjust the marks if necessary across the different teaching groups prior to submission.

Many centres are now using EDI or other software packages to make electronic submissions of marks instead of using the paper version of MS1; this system does not give the Moderator any indication of the “teaching groups”. Please ensure therefore that a paper copy of the EDI printout is marked showing which candidates are taught by the different teachers within the Centre. Please speak to the examinations officer in Centres to obtain a copy which needs to be annotated and sent to the Moderator.

The marking scheme was well understood by Centres and the layout of the booklet which gives guidance/suggested answers was found to be useful. Most Centres nudged well for elucidation but, regrettably, some persist in accepting dubious or anglicised pronunciation in the role plays which can affect the marking. Generally, Centres understood the rule of a maximum mark of 1 if more than one nudge occurs and they applied this well. Please remember that in role play tasks requiring a verb or one in which a candidate chooses to use a verb, the time frame must be correct for a mark of 2 to be rewarded. Candidates coped well with the unexpected/open tasks and are becoming increasingly familiar with the requirement to listen well to the cue prior to the task.

Some Centres were slightly generous in their application of the marking scheme in the Presentation section. Centres are reminded that the routine expression of opinions and

justifications is the key to gaining the highest marks. Factually correct and very accurate presentations do not necessarily fulfil the criteria in the scheme. As last year, the Quality of Language mark was applied a little harshly in some Centres with an able candidature, but the Quality of Language marks were generally applied well and consistently in Centres. The very best presentations featured not only control in the delivery and preparation, but also the regular use of opinions and justifications (refer to the mark scheme pertaining to the Presentation). Candidates should be encouraged in this section to express several opinions and then to justify those opinions, using a variety of linguistic structures, in order to gain the higher marks.

There were few cases of overlong examining this year. Please do remember to adhere very closely to the timings as it does not benefit candidates to speak for 20/25 minutes; on the contrary, it results in candidate and Examiner fatigue!

The quality of recordings was usually very good in Centres. Thank you.

As in 2004 the range of performance heard by Moderators was a full one. There were more entries at the Higher Tier than at the Foundation Tier and very few examples of inappropriate entry. Teachers are obviously more confident about the pitch and format of the test and the level of performance of their candidates. Moderators commented that they heard some extremely good performances at the top of the ability range.

On the whole, Centres assessed their candidates fairly. Many Centres had only small adjustments to bring them in line with the agreed standard; some had no adjustments at all.

Comments on Individual Questions (see also 2352)

Moderators commented that candidate performance was equal across the role play cards and that each card was accessible, having its easier and harder tasks.

Section 1

On Card One, **500** grams was not always well known and bag posed a problem to some candidates.

On Card Two, *ask if they have a room* was, surprisingly not well done.

On Card Three, the pronunciation of *ticket* was often anglicised and not always queried. As ever, some candidates persist in confusing *six* and *seize* when stating their age.

On Card Four, *sandwich* and *toilettes* were often mispronounced.

On Card Five, *chocolat* and *eau* were mispronounced.

On Card Six, candidates knew items of fruit but were not familiar with *crisps*.

On Card Seven, *stamps* was not well known or was often mispronounced.

On Card Eight, the pronunciation of *pain* and *say that's all* proved problematic to some candidates.

All other tasks were usually handled confidently by candidates.

Section 2

The cards were found to be accessible and equally balanced in terms of the areas of difficulty in each.

On Card One, *traveller's cheques* was found difficult by some. In Task 3, candidates often confused the concept of *forgetting* with the concept of *leaving*. Some examiners

changed the prompt before the third task which limited the mark to 1. Centres are reminded that the cue to the open task should not be changed.

On Card Two, candidates were not always sure as to how to say that *they did not have a reservation* and they often just said *they would like to make* a reservation or that *they already had* one. Pronunciation was often anglicised. Other tasks were well approached.

On Card Three, the first task was open to interpretation and any appropriate specific illness was acceptable. Again in Task 2, the negative form caused some problems, and some used inappropriate verbs to express age and nationality. Other tasks were well done.

On Card Four, the first three tasks were generally well done but many gave an anglicised rendering of *coton*. *Credit card* often poorly pronounced in French.

On Card Five, the first and last tasks were well done but some struggled with the problem they had to express in Task 2. Little reference was made to the room and efforts to complain about heat led some to some confusion.

On Card Six, the negative proved again to be problematic: Task 1. Other tasks were usually handled well but *euros* continues to be poorly pronounced.

On Card Seven, *guide* was poorly pronounced, but the most difficult task was asking *how long the tour would last*. This was handled well by only the best candidates. Other tasks were well done.

On Card Eight, *lost* in Task 1 was, surprisingly, not well known by many candidates. Other tasks were approached more confidently.

Section 3

It was pleasing to hear that there were relatively few Centres allowing this role play to become a monologue. It was clear that Centres have become confident in training candidates how to impress in this section of the test. Candidates usually perform well on areas common to all cards such as eating and drinking, daily routine, transport and leisure activities, and this year was no exception. Many are now well versed as to how to express reactions to the day's events, as they are in justifying their opinions.

Examiners usually intervened well when necessary in order to elucidate for meaning and keep a brisk pace. Please remember that the marking scheme here is based on communicative criteria. Please do not often query inaccurate auxiliaries or any other audible grammatical errors if the meaning is clear. This can spoil the flow of the candidate and slow the pace of the exercise.

It was very pleasing this year to hear candidates expressing a wider range of opinions and giving a wider variety of justifications. Although accuracy does not feature in the 8 available marks, the performance is taken into account when allocating the Quality of Language mark. There were some very accurate performances and Centres had heeded advice given in last year's report and on INSET sessions. The best performances featured a good use of structures such as adverbial time phrases to link different phases of the account, perfect infinitives, different expressions to convey opinions, accurate use of reflexives and the perfect and imperfect tenses. It was also

pleasing to hear a greater variety of subject pronouns such as *on* and *nous* being used. Candidates had been well prepared for this section of the test and were usually well able to respond to queries.

The cards were found to be equally balanced in terms of demands and at an appropriate level. The areas of difficulty on the cards were as follows:

Booklet 1: the correct conjugation of *ouvrir*. Some pupils were less comfortable with the context of working abroad. Some found *rencontrer* difficult to pronounce and weaker candidates did not realise that they were showing the group round.

Booklet 2: Many could not conjugate *mettre* and *ouvrir* and some were not familiar with the concept in *se promener le long de la Seine*.

Booklet 3: Some did not realise that they had spent the night on the boat and many found it hard to render *descendre du bateau*.

Booklet 4: Most sections of the account were handled well, but there was some confusion over *la visite d'une cave*.

Booklet 5: The most difficult area of vocabulary here was *admirer les beaux arbres*.

Booklet 6: Most coped well with the vocabulary of this context. The word *baptême* was glossed to ensure that the candidates understood the context. Details of the ceremony were not expected beyond what appeared on the Booklet. Some were not familiar with the verb *pleurer* and the conjugation of the verb *mettre* also caused some difficulty.

Booklet 7: Again, *descendre du bateau* was found to be difficult as was *prendre des photos*.

Booklet 8 was well attempted but the conjugation of *dormir* was not well done and few seemed familiar with *le paysage*.

Presentation

There were some interesting topics and it was very pleasing to hear no more than a small number of Centres where many candidates had followed the not-to-be-recommended practice of presenting the same topic. It is intended that the candidates choose the topic that they wish to present (with teacher guidance). Candidates made good use of cue cards and there were some very good performances which were delivered at an appropriate pace. The best performances were those which featured a range of opinions and justifications within a clear structure. Many candidates had evidently worked hard on their presentations.

Discussion and General Conversation

Centres followed up the Presentation with a good range of questioning techniques. Centres also correctly chose two topics from the lists. The conduct of this section of the examination was very professional and Examiners were clearly well aware of the need to ask a variety of questions in a variety of tenses. Candidates were therefore given plenty of opportunities to work for the full range of the Quality of Language marks.

Timings were generally good, but some Centres seemed unaware of the suggested timing in the Discussion Section (approximately 2 minutes).

The best performances heard in the General Conversation were those in which there was genuine interaction between the Examiner and the candidate and in which the Examiner listened carefully to the candidate, following up interesting leads when necessary. There were some very good performances from candidates and these were

frequently due to good examining pitched at a level appropriate to the candidate's ability. The most impressive performances displayed a natural response to open questions across a variety of tenses and structures. Such performances were evidence of the hard work which had preceded the examinations in many Foreign Language classrooms.

1925/2356

Written Coursework

General comments

Even though there was a small drop in the candidature this year, especially at the lower grade range, coursework still remains a very popular option with Centres. It was pleasing to see a much more accurate application of the marking criteria, both for communication and quality of language. Many Centres' marks remained unchanged as they fell comfortably within accepted standards for this component. The samples of work presented to moderators were often beautifully presented and indicated that teachers had put a lot of time and effort into the preparation of their candidates for their coursework pieces. It was therefore disappointing to see all their hard work spoilt by poor administration, which slows down the moderation process. It is essential that additions and transcriptions are checked with the utmost care and that the relevant documents sent to the moderators are completed accurately.

MS1 forms (or Centre generated equivalents) should indicate teaching groups as the sample selected by the Moderator should include an adequate coverage of the full range of marks in the Centre with examples of the marking of each teacher who marked candidates' work.

Many centres are now using EDI or other software packages to make electronic submissions of marks instead of the paper version of MS1; this system does not give the Moderator any indication of the "teaching groups". Please ensure therefore that a paper copy of the EDI printout is marked showing which candidates are taught by the different teachers within the Centre. Please speak to the examinations officer in Centres to obtain a copy which needs to be annotated and sent to the Moderator.

The Coursework Coversheet (CCS/1925) is a very important working document ensuring invaluable communication between the Centre and the Moderator and, therefore, its completion should be carried out with the greatest of care and accuracy.

The Candidate's name and number should be legible.

Each item should have a title and its context: "Un article sur mon collège" Context: 1(b)
Marks for communication and quality of language should be circled in blue or black and the total entered.

One of the boxes: either Controlled or Independent must be ticked for each piece.

Centres are reminded that:

The Moderator's name and signature are for the external Moderator, not for the Teacher who has internally moderated the work.

The section "Relevant comment or explanation" needs to be completed only if the Candidate has received extra help or advice or if there are any unusual circumstances.

The Candidate's three pieces of work should be attached by treasury tag to the coursework coversheet and be placed in the same order as on the coversheet.

Coursework requirements

• Contexts

The three pieces of work submitted should be from three different contexts: Everyday activities, Personal and social life, the World around us, the World of Work and the International World and **not** from sub-contexts within these. Consequently, a Candidate submitting a piece on school life (Context 1b) cannot submit another one on home life (Context 1a) or on health and fitness (Context 1d)

There were still such submissions this year and Centres had to be contacted to provide a replacement piece from a different context. Failure to provide a replacement piece resulted in the final mark being adjusted down, as the submission failed to fulfil the necessary requirements.

Controlled Conditions

At least one of the three pieces submitted **MUST** be done under controlled conditions and should be completed within one class session, with a bi-lingual dictionary as the only resource. Candidates may know in advance which sub-context is to be used, but should not know the exact title or sub-tasks or be over-prepared for the task. A piece of work submitted for assessment should not be identical with or closely resemble a practice task. Once again, failure to submit a controlled piece is contrary to the coursework requirements and results in the overall mark being adjusted. OCR acknowledges that it is sometimes difficult for teachers to get their pupils to produce three pieces of work. If a candidate does not manage to produce three pieces, the teacher should make the utmost effort to ensure that at least one piece of work has been written under controlled conditions. For this reason, teachers may if they wish set all three pieces to be written under controlled conditions.

It is very worrying to note the huge discrepancy of marks between controlled and independent pieces. While it is understood that candidates may perform less well under pressure, a difference of one grade or more should be investigated by teachers to discover why there is such a difference in standards. Candidates are required to sign the coversheet stating that: "these pieces are entirely my own"; teachers sign the Centre Authentication form to support this statement. These forms are part of the code of practice and should not be signed lightly.

Tasks and sub-tasks

It was very pleasing to see that the majority of Centres are now setting sub-tasks as these help Candidates focus on the points they have to address in their essays. However, the quality of the sub-tasks set is crucial if the candidates are to achieve their best both for communication and quality of language. When the same three tasks are set for the whole cohort, many Candidates are put at a disadvantage as the tasks fail to differentiate between different abilities: a task which is complex will be found too difficult for the weaker pupils; similarly, a task which is too simple will not allow the strong candidates to "show off".

At the top end, sub-tasks should encourage candidates to develop ideas and points of view, compare and contrast, give advantages and disadvantages and consider problems and solutions.

Tasks such as *Quels sont les avantages et les inconvénients du règlement scolaire ?/ des vacances à l'étranger/d'habiter en ville ou à la campagne?* offer Candidates the opportunity to consider different points of view and draw their own conclusions.

Centres should refrain from setting tasks which encourage candidates to adapt model letters (lettres de plainte/de réservation/de demande d'emploi) as these tend to limit the candidates' freedom to use original language. The candidates end up substituting words and phrases and produce very little language that they can claim as their own. Copying is a low order skill and therefore, attracts very few marks. A piece which "relies on appropriate copying" should be assessed in the 0-2 band for quality of language.

Other tasks, such as "la météo" and "moi et les autres", where Candidates have to describe several people they know fail to encourage the use of a variety of structures, vocabulary and verbs as their essays tend to re-use the same language.

The tasks set need to be appropriate to the candidates' ability. Setting unrealistic challenges disadvantage candidates who do not have the level of language to fulfil the task, and end up writing incomprehensible essays. Asking E/F/G Candidates to describe a trip to the moon or an accident they have witnessed, prevent them from showing what they know and can do as the tasks prove far too demanding for them.

The number of sub-tasks set is also important. Centres should aim at about 4 to 5 tasks. Setting 7 to 10 specific questions restrict the more able as it gives them little scope to show their real ability. Sub-tasks should be prescriptive and not left to the Candidates to decide which one(s) they will attempt. To help candidates include more detail in their answers Centres could include suggestions in brackets: Décris tes vacances l'année dernière (destination, voyage, logement).

In conclusion, if Centres want their candidates to perform their best, they need to consider the tasks they set with great care. If they set tasks which do not offer the appropriate challenge the outcome can be rather disappointing at all grade ranges.

Word count

Centres are reminded of the suggested length in each grade range: 140-150 words for A*-B, 90-100 for C-D and 40-85 for E-F. It has been noticed that Candidates tend to submit essays well in excess of the recommended word count at all grade range. This **MUST** be discouraged as Candidates who write lengthy pieces include irrelevant material, repeat the same ideas and language and make more mistakes which affect their marks for both communication and quality of language. At the first draft stage teachers should remind their Candidates that they **MUST** keep to the recommended length. Essays of 200 words or more are becoming far too common and this should be prevented.

Use of sources

Candidates **MUST** list their sources at the foot of each piece of work, including: i) page numbers of course books, where appropriate; ii) full web-site addresses (not just: "yahoo.fr" for example); iii) acknowledgement of the use of French spelling or grammar checkers on computers. Teachers should ensure that the coursework task is clearly distinct from practice work; candidates cannot simply copy out a piece of previously marked work or reproduce a pre-learned response to a known task, as was at times evident in the controlled pieces submitted.

It was evident that in some Centres work from the majority of candidates, or from the candidates in one or more teaching groups, was based heavily on common source material. This resulted in some cases in Candidates producing almost identical pieces.

Candidates cannot be rewarded for language which is clearly not their own and therefore the mark for quality of language should be adjusted down accordingly.

Application of marking criteria

As indicated above, there were fewer adjustments of Centres' marks this year than last year. Many teachers have now realised that there is a close correlation between the communication and quality of language marks. Even though it is quite common for a piece of work to be awarded marks in different bands for communication and quality of language, there should not be a wide difference between the two.

Centres are reminded that each piece of work should be assessed on its own merits but that the communication marks will be affected negatively if the word count over the three pieces taken together falls below the minimum word count.

If there is no evidence of at least one correct use of a verb in each of the three time frames: present, past and future over the three pieces, the maximum mark awarded for each piece is 6.

Communication

For Candidates to be awarded marks in the top three bands it is important to consider the amount of detail, justifications of opinions and points of view and longer sequences contained in the piece.

A piece where the sentences are "extended" by the use of "et", "mais" and "parce que" does not qualify for "longer sequences". This is achieved by the use of a range of clause types and verbal constructions. A very accurate piece which lacks sophistication and displays a large amount of "j'ai aimé, j'ai trouvé ça ..., j'ai détesté ... parce que c'était + adjective or parce que j'aime/je déteste ..." fails to qualify for "detailed" descriptions or justifications of ideas and points of view.

To decide which mark-band to select it is therefore essential to consider all the criteria within the band, taking into consideration the phrasing of each criterion:

For 8: Communicates personal opinions in some detail; some ideas and points of view expressed with occasional justification.

For 9: Communicates and justifies ideas and points of view and communicates in longer sequences, giving descriptions.

For 10: Communicates and justifies a range of ideas and points of view; communicates in longer sequences, giving detailed descriptions; ideas and points of view freely expressed and justified.

Many pieces were routinely awarded 9 or 10 when they lacked the necessary amount of detail and range to qualify for the top two bands. To achieve a 7, the piece should show that all the sub-tasks have been attempted and successfully communicated. When the language used affects the clarity of the message, the mark should be reduced accordingly. A piece which fails to communicate personal opinions and does not contain linked sentences within structured ideas should not be awarded 7 for communication.

Quality of Language

The variety and range of structure, vocabulary, idioms and clause types will be a determining factor when choosing the correct mark-band as well as the variety of verbs and tenses used.

It is neither possible nor desirable to try to quantify but a candidate who shows that he/she is in control of the language rather than the other way round, will score highly. The repetition of the same structure or clause type (eg: après avoir fait ça; qui s'appelle; je pense que) fails to give an overall impression of variety and breadth. Candidates need to show that they can use a variety of sophisticated language with ease rather than a couple of structures which keep recurring in their essays.

Centres are still too readily inclined to reward with high marks (top two bands) essays which are accurate but lack sophistication. A variety of clause types such as: "que, ce que, ce qui, quand, où" and verbal constructions such as: "après + perfect infinitive, avant de" and other conjunctions followed by an infinitive, the use of the present participle should be evident in the top two bands.

A variety of verbs and tenses would also be expected at that level. The secure use of the perfect tense contrasted with the imperfect tense, the accurate use of the pluperfect and conditional, which are all part of the defined content for higher tier, enhance the standard of the piece and demonstrate the candidate's ability to use grammatical items accurately.

Conclusion

It was very pleasing to see that many Centres had acted upon the advice given to them in the Report to Centre and the Examiners' Report concerning the 2004 session. Those who still experience difficulties applying the coursework requirements and marking criteria would be well advised to read the specification booklet carefully and attend the INSET training sessions organised by OCR.

**Unit Threshold Marks – 1925: GCSE French
June 2005 Assessment Session**

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	a*	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	u
2351/01	Raw	50	N/A	N/A	N/A	36	29	22	16	10	0
	UMS	59	N/A	N/A	N/A	50	40	30	20	10	0
2351/02	Raw	50	41	35	26	17	13	11	N/A	N/A	0
	UMS	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	N/A	N/A	0
2352/01	Raw	50	N/A	N/A	N/A	26	20	14	9	4	0
	UMS	59	N/A	N/A	N/A	50	40	30	20	10	0
2352/02	Raw	50	40	34	29	24	17	13	N/A	N/A	0
	UMS	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	N/A	N/A	0
2353/01	Raw	50	N/A	N/A	N/A	27	22	18	14	10	0
	UMS	59	N/A	N/A	N/A	50	40	30	20	10	0
2353/02	Raw	50	36	29	21	14	10	8	N/A	N/A	0
	UMS	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	N/A	N/A	0
2354/01	Raw	50	N/A	N/A	N/A	39	32	25	19	13	0
	UMS	59	N/A	N/A	N/A	50	40	30	20	10	0
2354/02	Raw	50	44	37	27	17	11	8	N/A	N/A	0
	UMS	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	N/A	N/A	0
2355/01	Raw	50	N/A	N/A	N/A	26	20	14	9	4	0
	UMS	59	N/A	N/A	N/A	50	40	30	20	10	0
2355/02	Raw	50	40	34	29	24	17	13	N/A	N/A	0
	UMS	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	N/A	N/A	0
2356/01	Raw	90	82	76	66	57	46	36	26	16	0
	UMS	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	10	0

Syllabus Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (i.e. after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
1925	360	320	280	240	200	160	120	80	40	0

Report on the Units taken in June 2005

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U	Total Number of Candidates
1925	11.80	25.97	44.50	71.25	89.38	97.24	99.62	99.98	100	42974

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Information Bureau

(General Qualifications)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: helpdesk@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2005



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

