

GCSE

Edexcel GCSE

Italian (1237)

This Examiners' Report relates to Mark
Scheme Publication code: UG016677

Summer 2005

advancing learning, changing lives

Examiners' Report

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

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

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

Summer 2005

Publications Code UG016677

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2005

Contents

Paper 1F Examiners' Report	1
Paper 1H Examiner' Reports	3
Paper 2F/H Examiners' Report	7
Paper 3F Examiners' Report	11
Paper 3H Examiners' Report	13
Paper 4F Examiners' Report	15
Paper 4H Examiners' Report	17
Paper 4C Examiners' Report	19
Statistics	21

Edexcel Ltd holds the copyright for this publication. Further copies of the **Examiners' Report** may be obtained from Edexcel Publications.

Paper 1F Listening and Responding

Questions 1 - 10, *Casa e Famiglia*, were very well answered by the vast majority of candidates, most of whom managed to score full marks on this section. There were some candidates who were confused about the number of brothers and sisters in Question 1, but the most commonly misunderstood questions were 9 and 10, where 'nonni' and 'pranzo' were not recognised.

Questions 11 - 15, *I vestiti*, was well answered by most candidates, but it did challenge the very weakest, many of whom did not recognise the first item of clothing, 'maglia' in question 11, and some had problems with 'scarpe' in question 12 and 'borsa' in question 13.

Question 16, *In città*, caused problems at both levels. The target grade was D, but the complex nature of the map, coupled with some fairly challenging language on the tape script were confusing for many candidates. It is not always easy to provide a variety of attractive Target Language question types which do not challenge candidates in other respects and which focus solely on the comprehension of the language. This question challenged candidates geographically as well as linguistically as was demonstrated by poor performance even at Higher level on this question. Some of the vocabulary was not correctly understood, such as 'tra', 'edicola' and 'accanto'.

Question 17, *Dal dottore*. This question was well answered on the whole, with many candidates gaining full marks at both levels. It was felt that some of the pictures could have been slightly more specific, especially A, where the man is clutching his stomach, but also has one hand on his back, and this was to be matched with 'ho vomitato'. Also picture D, where the cartoon representation to match up with 'ho la febbre a quaranta' is of a somewhat different style of image from the other pictures.

Question 18, *La lista della spesa*, was a relatively simple question, requiring fairly basic recognition of items and on the whole, was well answered by most candidates. There was a surprising number, however, who failed to listen to the whole passage and just placed their crosses by the first item they heard on the tape. Candidates must be well prepared to distinguish between what is **not** selected, but only discussed on the tape as a red herring.

Question 19, *Tempo libero*, was very well answered by all but the weakest of candidates. This was perhaps one of the more confusing of the new question types as it involved a large grid on which to place the correct crosses, but candidates on the whole rose to the occasion.

Question 20, Lo scambio, was a great success as a form fill question type and it is a credit to the candidates and their teachers that this was very well done indeed. Even weaker candidates were able to answer many of the questions in the target language and performed well on this question which was targeted at Grade C. Certain misspellings were tolerated if the message was conveyed, such as 'aereo' and 'martedì'. There was a great deal of misspelling of 'scuola', some of which were accepted, but 'squalo' was rejected as it means shark. Even 'casa' was frequently misspelt, and was rejected when written as 'cassa' as it could have meant till or cash register. A surprising number of candidates wrote 'biglietti' for question b which required the means of transport. Once again, just a few candidates were penalised by writing the correct information in the wrong place, which is understandable as it is not always easy to coordinate the listening to the tape and transcribing the answer and it requires much practice especially for weaker candidates.

Question 21, Il tempo, was very straightforward for candidates who had managed to master the weather vocabulary and this was evident at both levels. It proved a challenge for weaker candidates, however. For these weaker candidates it is perhaps understandable that there may be some confusion between 'caldo' equating it with the English 'cold', but it is something which is really basic and needs to be drummed home. The illustrations on this question were very clear and the vocabulary on the transcript was both basic and straightforward. The poor performance of weaker candidates on this question is an example of how it is difficult to review basic topics sufficiently when there is so much else to cover on the syllabus.

Question 22, Holidays.

This question was extremely accessible to all but the very weakest of candidates. In fact, candidates who had scored badly on some earlier questions were sometimes able to gain full marks on this last section. The least well answered question in this section was c, where candidates failed to identify 'il mare'. Some candidates struggled with 'ballare' in 23 c and many failed to put in a qualifier for question 23 d, where the response required something more than just 'good' or 'fun' to describe 'meravigliosa'.

Paper 1H Listening and Responding

Question 1 *Il tempo*, was very straightforward for candidates who had managed to master the weather vocabulary, this was evident at both levels. It proved a challenge for weaker candidates, however. For these weaker candidates it is perhaps understandable that there may be some confusion between 'caldo' equating it with the English 'cold', but it is something which is really basic and needs to be drummed home. The illustrations on this question were very clear and the vocabulary on the transcript was both basic and straightforward. The poor performance of weaker candidates on this question is an example of how it is difficult to review basic topics sufficiently when there is so much else to cover on the syllabus.

Question 2 - Dal dottore. This question was well answered on the whole, with many candidates gaining full marks at both levels. It was felt that some of the pictures could have been slightly more specific, especially A, where the man is clutching his stomach, but also has one hand on his back, and this was to be matched with 'ho vomitato'. Also picture D, where the cartoon representation to match up with 'ho la febbre a quaranta' is of a somewhat different style of image from the other pictures.

Question 3 - Lo scambio, was a great success as a form fill question type and it is a credit to the candidates and their teachers that this was very well done indeed. Even weaker candidates were able to answer many of the questions in the target language and performed well on this question which was targeted at Grade C. Certain misspellings were tolerated if the message was conveyed, such as 'aereo' and 'martedì'. There was a great deal of misspelling of 'scuola', some of which were accepted, but 'squalo' was rejected as it means shark. Even 'casa' was frequently misspelt, and was rejected when written as 'cassa' as it could have meant till or cash register. A surprising number of candidates wrote 'biglietti' for question b which required the means of transport. Once again, just a few candidates were penalised by writing the correct information in the wrong place, which is understandable as it is not always easy to coordinate the listening to the tape and transcribing the answer and it requires much practice especially for weaker candidates.

Question 4, 'Giovani e genitori' This question caused some difficulties for average or weaker candidates, but was very well answered by good candidates. Some candidates were confused by the question type which did not provide an example and some failed to make any mark on a, leaving a blank. Very few candidates placed an extra cross, and the most correct answers were for 4 d.

Question 5, 'La spiaggia ideale'. Many candidates found this question challenging, and its target grade was A, but even weaker candidates were able to score some marks especially on questions d and e. The rubric was fairly challenging in itself and many candidates had obviously spent their five minutes preparation time very well indeed by writing notes by the suggested answers. This is essential for candidates to access the more complex questions on this paper and it is a pity to watch some candidates during Listening papers loose concentration during the gaps instead of focusing on the next question to anticipate the transcript.

Question 6 - In città, caused problems at both levels. The target grade was D, but the complex nature of the map, coupled with some fairly challenging language on the tape script were confusing for many candidates. It is not always easy to provide a variety of attractive Target Language question types which do not challenge candidates in other respects and which focus solely on the comprehension of the language. This question challenged candidates geographically as well as linguistically as was demonstrated by poor performance even at Higher level on this question. Some of the vocabulary was not correctly understood, such as 'tra', 'edicola' and 'accanto'.

Question 7, 'Il tango con un cane'

Candidates coped very well indeed with this question which required good understanding of the written suggestions as well as of the tape, which contained some fairly sophisticated vocabulary. The concept of dancing with a dog was also a little out of the ordinary, but once more, candidates certainly rose to the occasion. The target grade for this question was A, so weaker candidates understandably found this hard.

Question 8 - La lista della spesa was a relatively simple question, requiring fairly basic recognition of items and on the whole, was well answered by most candidates. There was a surprising number, however, who failed to listen to the whole passage and just placed their crosses by the first item they heard on the tape. Candidates must be well prepared to distinguish between what is **not** selected, but only discussed on the tape as a red herring.

Question 9, 'Il fast food in Italia'.

This question was answered extremely well by very many candidates who often scored full marks on this section of the paper. The rubric on this question was simpler than on question 7 and the tape script, although longer, was also more straightforward. Candidates have become experts at this question type, and are readily able to match the person to the written text.

Questions 10 - 12, 'Differences between the sexes'.

This question, targeted at A*, was extremely challenging even for the most able of candidates. Some candidates who had scored full marks up to this point or almost full marks, still failed to gain more than 6 out of 10 on this question. Only the most talented were able to perform comfortably on this section. Many of the average or weaker candidates were not able to score any points at all in this section, but happily had been able to make this up earlier on in the paper.

The very first question, Q10(a), posed problems for the majority of candidates as there was some confusion between the differences between the sexes in schools and some candidates were unfortunate in not specifying 'Italian' or 'in Italy' in their response here. In 10 b, there was a great deal of confusion between girls and boys and determining who actually performed better and in Q10(b)(ii), some candidates stated that there was no difference at all, whereas the transcript only mentions 'diminuisce'. Some unfortunate candidates assumed that either girls or boys were 'braver', mistaking the Italian 'brave' in this instance. However, Q10(b)(ii), was the best answered in the first section of this part as many candidates were able to glean the meaning of 'diminuisce'.

Q11(a)(i), was the one part of this section where candidates were able to answer confidently, and many also managed to answer Q11(a)(ii) correctly, although there was a certain amount of confusion over the word 'lettura', with some candidates saying girls liked lectures. 11b was even more of a challenge, with many candidates making wild guesses with answers like 'girls are more interested in fashion or boys' or that girls became easily distracted by boys.

Q12 was equally challenging, with many candidates getting confused here between girls and boys and many, on hearing the Italian 'arrivano', jumped to the conclusion that the time of arrival at school was one of the factors affecting learning. Some candidates wrongly specified 'children, pupils or girls' in Q12(a), so losing the point for Q12(b), where they were asked reasons for what happened in secondary schools. Here, if they answered simply 'they' start to think of their futures, the answer was not allowed unless it was clear that the candidate had understood or implied that it referred to 'boys'. Many candidates were able to score a point on Q12(c), even if they had struggled with the previous questions.

The conclusion that can be drawn from this year's Listening papers is that candidates certainly performed in the true character of the targeted grades. On the Foundation Paper, the last question, targeted at grade E, was well answered by good and average Foundation candidates. On the Higher Paper, candidates were most challenged by the questions targeted at grade A and most especially A*, which is in fact the purpose of allocating points to each grade.

Paper 2F/H Speaking

As with last year's examination, it is very pleasing to report that the standards were high, with most candidates very well prepared for the requirements of both Higher and Foundation Tiers. It is to the credit of teacher-examiners that in all but a few cases, students were entered at the correct level, and that the tests were so efficiently conducted.

Most teacher examiners were at ease with the format and conduct of the examination, and had familiarised themselves with the role-plays before starting the tests. They were therefore able to give candidates all their attention, using good examining technique. Most were also able to encourage the candidates to display their skills in both parts of the conversation.

The candidates who achieved the best results were those who developed their replies, especially in role-play C, and whose conversation was a genuine dialogue, allowing them to discuss their experiences and opinions, with a wide range of language and tenses. Many students had interesting things to say, showing they had prepared well for the test.

One area of improvement is in the conduct of role-plays B and C.

The answer to a rephrased question cannot be credited. This means that teacher examiners who changed the wording of a rubric after candidates had given an incorrect answer did not help them gain more marks. They also risked unsettling the students, causing them not to perform as well for the rest of the role-play. Similarly, in order to maintain consistency, examiners are instructed not to accept the answer to a rephrased unpredictable question.

If a candidate's expanded response anticipated an unpredictable question, the teacher examiner should still ask the unpredictable question for the reply to be credited. This also ensures that the candidate does not become confused, waiting for that unpredictable question. For example, in role-play B1, if a candidate answered the first question with: *Vado al cinema alle otto*, the teacher examiner should continue with the script and then say: *Buon'idea! Scusi, ma... a che ora esci?*

Another area for the attention of the Examining Officers is the administration of the tests, ensuring that the correct paperwork is completed and forwarded, and that cassettes are clearly labelled, in accordance with the teacher examiner's handbook. This is particularly relevant when candidates are not tested in the centre where they were entered, or are not examined by their usual teacher.

Role-play A

Very few problems were reported.
A2 - *arancia* was often not known.
A3 - *biglietto* was often not known.

Role-play B

B1 - many candidates had difficulties with asking if they could help.
B2 - there was some uncertainty about the ailments pictured, especially the broken leg.
B3 - a few candidates did not ask for any of the items pictured.
B4 - *verdura* was often not known.
B5 - *francobollo* and *cartolina* often not known. Some asked for *un francobollo*, or *francobolli*, when the alternatives pictured clearly were *due*, *tre* or *quattro francobolli*. Some asked: *due francobolli per l'Inghilterra*, and were not asked the unpredictable: *per dove?*

Role-play C

Although many candidates expanded their answers, it is worth stressing that the top marks can only be achieved by those offering more than minimal sentences. This does not mean a mini-conversation should develop. For example, for role-play C2, rather than saying: *C'è un treno per Bologna?* which adds little to the cue, the student could say: *Mi può dire se tutti i treni per Bologna sono cancellati oggi?*

C1 - *tempo domani?* was often not understood. Some Teacher-Examiners omitted the second unpredictable.
C2 - *soluzione?* was considered by some candidates to be the same as the cue *autobus?*, thereby missing one utterance. Some only said *sì*, *va bene* as a reply to the second unpredictable.
C3 - some candidates were unsure what to say for *soluzione?* and only offered *c'è una soluzione?*
C4 - some offered little or no expansion. The cue *durata?* was not always understood.
C5 - candidates who had mentioned a detailed problem as a response to task 2 sometimes had difficulties answering the first unpredictable with a different utterance.
C6 - the second unpredictable was answered by some with just one word, e.g.: *lunedì* or *domani*.

Conversation

It was very pleasing to hear so many excellent conversations, both at Foundation and Higher Levels. Most teacher examiners adjusted their questions to the ability of their candidates, giving them the best opportunity to express and justify their opinions, and to converse in different tenses.

Those who rigidly went through the questions suggested in the handbook only, tended to discourage students from demonstrating their full ability. Open questions and questions encouraging clarification or expansion of what the candidate has just said are a good way of eliciting developed responses. This is particularly worth remembering when the students are native speakers, who may be less aware of examination technique and more likely to give minimal answers, or answers in the present tense only.

Whilst an initial pre-learnt introduction to the first topic allows candidates to build-up their confidence, this should not go on for too long and turn into a monologue. A spontaneous dialogue, even with a few hesitations and errors, gives better results than 'perfect' parrot-like responses.

Paper 3F Reading and Responding

The number of candidates entered at this level remains proportionately lower than those for Paper 3H. Most candidates seemed to have been entered at the correct level but there were a few who performed extremely well at this level and should have been entered for the Higher Tier. The paper was accessible to the vast majority so that almost all candidates were able to attempt every question. There were still a few instances of candidates failing to read the rubric carefully and answering in the wrong language (q.3-9-10), which resulted in the loss of some marks.

Question 1

This was generally well done, as most students seemed to be familiar with food items. Only *caffè* and less often *fragola* were not recognised at times. Yet again many wrong answers for this question featured F (*frutti di bosco*), which could not be correct as it was used in the example!

Question 2

This was generally answered well although a few candidates incorrectly chose D (*pallacanestro*). There were a few instances of candidates putting a cross in every single line, with subsequent loss of marks. Candidates should be dissuaded from doing this as it always results in a loss of marks.

Question 3

This question proved quite demanding for some Foundation candidates. A surprising large number of candidates were unable to fill in *Professione*, with incorrect answers such as *moda* or *televisione* or even *concorso*. For *Età*, while many correctly put *37 anni*, *17 anni* was not uncommon. For *Luogo di nascita* many candidates did not know *luogo* and incorrectly wrote either *italiano* or *Milano*, thus showing that they did not understand *è nata* in the text. The *Interessi* section was usually well done but for *Piatto preferito* many candidates surprisingly did not make the connection between *preferito* and *adora* in the text and equally did not understand *odia* in the text, thus opting incorrectly for *patate fritte* or even just *fritte*. Some put both *lasagne* and *patate fritte*, which was rejected, as it did not demonstrate comprehension of the text. Sadly, a few candidates again failed to score any marks at all for this question because they answered in English.

Question 4

This was generally well done but a few failed to make the connection between *computer* in (i) and *pc* in the text, despite the similarity with English, and opted for E (*receptionist*) instead.

Question 5

This was answered reasonably well on the whole, but a common mistake was to put *Sonia* for (ii) and *Silvana* for (iii).

Question 6

This was as usual a challenging question for the Foundation Tier but most score something, particularly with *carina* for (i). This type of question tested not only the candidates' understanding of the text but also their knowledge of grammar.

Question 7

This question was quite straightforward in terms of vocabulary but many candidates failed to identify *portafoglio* and at times *quaderno*, often opting for I (ruler) instead.

Question 8

The vast majority of candidates seemed to be very familiar with the vocabulary relating to parts of the house, so this question was generally well done, with the vast majority gaining full marks.

Question 9

Most candidates managed to score at least a couple of points in this question, but in (a) "June" or even "July" were quite common. In (b) most candidates were familiar with clothing but *magliette* was sometimes mistaken for "jumpers". Disappointingly, basic numbers are still frequently not known, therefore (c) was at times answered as "15%". As for (d) the most popular incorrect answer was "ruler", clearly confusing *regalo* with *righe*.

Question 10

Again, most candidates managed to score at least a couple of points in this question, with only a few answering "in the city centre" or "outside" in (a). However a surprising number of candidates were not familiar with the days of the week and (e) elicited all possible days, with Monday being the most common incorrect answer. A very small number of candidates failed to score any marks at all in q.9 and 10 because they answered in Italian.

Paper 3H Reading and Responding

On the whole the paper was quite accessible and many candidates were able to cope well with it and even achieve very high marks. There were very few instances of candidates being entered at an inappropriate level for this paper. Again, only a small number answered Qu1, Qu5 and Qu9 in the wrong language, thus losing some marks.

Question 1

This was generally answered well by Higher candidates but even at this level some failed to make the connection between *adora* and *preferito* and failed to identify *odia*, thus incorrectly answering *patate fritte* in *Piatto preferito*.

Question 2

This question was also generally answered well.

Question 3

This was done reasonably well by the majority of candidates. The most common mistake was to cross (d) rather than (e) focusing on *biscotti* in the text and failing to spot *piuttosto che*, which preceded it. (g) was also a common choice, clearly involving a misunderstanding of *evitare* in the text. A few candidates crossed too many boxes, thus losing marks.

Question 4

This was quite a challenging question, as it is a grammar test as well as a comprehension exercise. Most candidates managed to score at least a couple of points but (iv) and (v) proved particularly tricky: in (iv) *si preoccupa* was possibly not recognized and in (v) *vive* was often wrongly associated with *Roma* in C (ignoring the preposition in front, *da*, which in terms of grammar ruled out this combination). The weaker ones simply resorted to guessing.

Question 5

Most candidates coped well with (a). In (b) weaker candidates lost marks by repeating the same element more than once, failing to understand that *siti dedicate alle vacanze*, *viaggiare* and *occasioni per partire* meant the same thing, but most added correctly *siti di musica/cinema*. Others incorrectly answered *ultime notizie* omitting *cinema*. In (c) some only wrote *avere un rapporto*, omitting the crucial *con i fan*, but good candidates demonstrated their ability to manipulate the language in the text to form their answers e.g. *avrà.../potrà rispondere...* A few candidates failed to score any marks by answering in English.

Question 6

Most candidates scored at least a couple of points but (iii) was commonly answered as C focusing on *tre persone* in the text but failing to understand *almeno*, which preceded it in the question. This misunderstanding of *meno* also led to mistakes in (v), with C as a popular answer, while in (iv) some possibly confused *scrivere* in the question with *iscritti* in the text.

Question 7

This question was generally well done at this level.

Question 8

This was a fairly challenging question, which was answered much better at Higher level but still proved demanding in parts. In (i) *brutta* was sometimes chosen instead of *carina* and in (v) occasionally *partire* instead of *mandare*.

Question 9

This year this question, which is targeted at the very best candidates, was again answered successfully by many, who were able to achieve quite high marks, but very few managed to score full marks. As usual, weaker candidates were clearly simply guessing in parts, drawing from their general knowledge of environmental issues.

In Q(a) many candidates lost the second mark by omitting to explain *why* the event took place. *Scoprire* was often not recognised.

In Q(b) the question was sometimes misread so that a few candidates answered "where" instead of "when", with a logical (but incorrect) "in Italy" or even "in Spain", possibly confused by *in espansione* in the text. Some better candidates understood "one century" but omitted "ago" so that their answer did not make sense.

In Q(c) candidates scored at least one point but for the second point some failed to qualify the plants ("rare") or the animals ("risking extinction") or else ignored the second part of the sentence relating to man and nature (the mark scheme accepted any two out of three points).

In Q(d) most candidates achieved one point ("go for walks/guided tours") but many wrongly translated *pulizia* as "police" or "pollution" or else resorted to guessing, such as "planting trees". *Boschi* was often not known although it was not required for the second mark.

In Q(e) weaker candidates tried even more wild guesses, ranging from "go shopping" to "go for a pizza" (probably due to confusion between *pizza* and *piazza*). *Entrare in contatto con volontari* was often misinterpreted as "become a volunteer", while *raccogliere informazioni* was wrongly translated as "give out information" rather than "collect". Very few were able to convey the idea of watching a music show: most translated *assistere* as "to assist", unaware that the word is a "false friend". Many incorrectly thought that *uno spettacolo musicale* was a musical. Only the very best candidates correctly answered this.

Q(f) was generally answered correctly, although some candidates crossed more than one box (some crossed all three!).

Generally speaking, however, the overall standard was quite high, with many candidates scoring well over half marks in both Tiers, but full marks in the Higher Tier paper were not so common due to mistakes or omissions in Question 9.

Paper 4F Writing

On the whole standards were quite varied but the majority of Foundation Tier candidates managed to score reasonably well, especially in the first three questions, which are marked essentially for communication rather than for quality of language, while the overlap question as usual proved quite demanding for some F candidates. On the other hand there were quite a few candidates who obtained a very high score in this paper, demonstrating a range of vocabulary and tenses together with a high level of accuracy, and who should have been entered at the Higher Tier.

Question 1

The majority of candidates answered this question well, with a variety of vocabulary relating to clothes and school. Items of food and drink were also accepted in the mark scheme for section (b). A few candidates left some blanks while others lost marks in the second part by repeating items in both (a) and (b). Marks were also lost through inclusion of non-Italian items of vocabulary (mostly French) or words which were spelled too incorrectly to be recognizable by a sympathetic native speaker.

Question 2

Again, the majority of candidates responded fully to this question, at least in terms of communication, as most sentences were generally completed. Most displayed a good knowledge of lexis, producing appropriate vocabulary with fairly accurate spelling. A common vocabulary mistake was "glace" in (c) but most of the other vocabulary items were recognizable, although not always correctly spelt (*giardino* proved particularly difficult for some, while *lettera* was often spelt as "*lettura*"). This question was possibly less demanding, in terms of grammar, compared to previous years as it required the first person of the verb (with which candidates should be more familiar) rather than the third, so on the whole the verbs were done quite well. A few conjugated *lavorare* as "*lavo*", thus losing the communication marks for it, as it conveyed a different message. Many were able to produce correctly even the irregular *vado*. However some responded using the third person singular.

Question 3

This question was completed well with little omission or ambiguity. Most candidates were able to state the date of their birthday, although often not in the correct Italian format, to describe what they do for their birthday and what presents they would like to receive. Some even described what they did for their last birthday, using the past tense and getting credit for it. Candidates generally scored high or even full marks for communication but accuracy was variable, although on the whole appropriate for the task.

Question 4 (a)

This was by far the more popular choice of the two questions: as it dealt with the well-rehearsed topic of free time and pastimes it enabled candidates to draw on well-established and familiar categories of vocabulary and structures. By definition this overlap question proved quite challenging for Foundation candidates but the majority completed it at least adequately with a pleasing number of candidates showing an ability to use a range of vocabulary and structures to create longer sentences even at Foundation level. Many candidates managed to display a range of tenses, including the imperfect and the future or the conditional (*vorrei/mi piacerebbe*). Weaker candidates however struggled with the past tense and some even with the present tense, often resorting to using simply the infinitive preceded by *io*. Some good candidates lost content marks by saying what they liked/disliked but omitting the reason why (and therefore not expressing an opinion, which is required by the overlap question).

Question 4 (b)

Clearly the minority choice, this question was also fairly well done by those who opted for it, although at Foundation level it proved slightly more demanding than Qu4(a), perhaps because it required some understanding of the stimulus and the choice of jobs on offer. Therefore some candidates misunderstood the second task and wrote about the job they would like to do in the future rather than one of the jobs in the adverts. Other candidates devoted most of their letter to their personal details, often including pre-learnt irrelevant material about their family or their house and omitting the other two bullet points. The third task proved difficult for candidates who did not have a good grasp of the past tense.

Paper 4H Writing

Question 1(a)

This question was the most popular choice even at Higher Level. Most candidates produced coherent responses, longer than required, but clearly at ease with opinions, descriptions and a range of tenses, including not only the perfect but also the imperfect and the future tense or conditional. Most showed an ability to manipulate the language to carry out the required tasks, although the quality of the language (accuracy and variety of vocabulary and structures) was quite variable. Some displayed very complex, albeit pre-learned, phrases with the subjunctive and the conditional such as "*se avessi molti soldi farei...*", for which they were duly rewarded.

Question 1(b)

This question was a minority choice even at this level. Those who opted for this tended to produce more concise responses, displaying again a good knowledge of various tenses and an ability to express likes and dislikes, opinions and descriptions appropriate to the task. There were also some very good answers which used the correct formal letter format and register.

Question 2(a)

This was by far the majority choice for the Higher task. The majority of candidates showed an ability to go beyond a minimal response to this question, providing an exhaustive description of their school, an account of their previous day and expressing their views on their school. Obviously descriptions and opinions varied from a simplistic approach to the more detailed and fluent, but most candidates displayed a good knowledge of vocabulary relating to school life.

Again, a variety of tenses was displayed, although more complex structures like the conditional, which was required by the last bullet point to suggest possible changes or improvements to their school, proved difficult for the weaker candidates.

This last point proved to be the most challenging, not just in terms of language structures required to make suggestions but also in terms of content. A few candidates misunderstood the question in the stimulus and wrote about their future plans for next year or when they leave school. On the other hand some were able to use complex structures such as *se potessi/ se avessi la scelta* followed by the conditional.

Question 2(b)

A minority choice, again this year this was generally the choice of the native or near native speakers or often adult learners who were on the whole able to recount a story about their TV appearance, using appropriate structures for a narrative piece (perfect, imperfect and future). The task left much scope to imagination, as candidates could tell any story they liked provided it arose from the stimulus. Unfortunately some candidates did not make the most of it, omitting to give details of the programme and only giving the name. However there were many instances of very imaginative and interesting responses, ranging from Big Brother to being a dancer or singer or taking part in a talk show or even being interviewed for their previous (often heroic) actions.

General Comments on 4F and 4H

- Again, a range of tenses had been well prepared, including the future and the conditional and at times even the subjunctive, although candidates appeared much more secure when writing in the first person singular rather than other persons.
- Candidates should avoid using complex structures (conditional/subjunctive/*dopo aver...*) if they are unable to handle them. It would be better for them to reinforce and use correctly simpler tenses such as the present and the past: they are more likely to score higher marks by using the correct present or past tense without mistakes rather than by using an incorrect subjunctive.
- Candidates should also avoid regurgitating what is obviously pre-learnt material that can be irrelevant and can lead to the omission of required bullet points: for example, in question 2a and b (H paper) some wrote at length about the environment and what should be done to protect it, which was at best only partly relevant to the tasks. Also, teachers should encourage a more individual approach to the Writing paper. Instead it is often the case that all candidates from one centre seem to have seen exactly the same film or to hate exactly the same food in their school canteen...
- *Bene, buono* and *bello* are often confused and used incorrectly.
- Most candidates did not seem confident in the use of pronouns.
- *Mi è piaciuto* is often produced inaccurately.
- The discriminating factor in terms of language remains the level of accuracy, especially genders and agreements.
- The standard of spelling was very high, despite some interference from other languages, mainly French or Spanish.
- As a final point, candidates are again reminded of the importance of "clear and orderly presentation": they really need to consider that work which is illegible cannot gain marks.

Paper 4C Coursework

Again the flexibility of the coursework option provided candidates of all levels of ability with the opportunity to communicate effectively in written Italian on a variety of topics.

Work was generally of a high standard, well presented and substantial in content. Tasks chosen by teachers and candidates were generally appropriate and the range of tasks undertaken was excellent. There were some varied and very interesting topics and pieces, including profiles of famous people and articles about a healthy lifestyle. It is recommended that teachers continue the good practice of using the task banks provided, which they can adapt to suit their own individual topic preferences and their students' needs.

However, the problem of topic overlap was at times encountered, for example between daily routine "At Home and Abroad" and daily routine at "Work Experience and School" or between accounts of activities during holidays ("At Home and Abroad") and at the weekend ("Social Activities and Free Time"). This was particularly in evidence where teachers had set very vague and open titles such as "House, Home and Family", which cover many sub-topics and are very likely to cause overlap. The tasks set should be more focused: this would avoid the inclusion of the same material in more than one piece of work and would enable candidates to display a variety of tenses.

The range of language displayed in the coursework was again impressive. Many tasks had been specifically designed to include a range of tenses and complex structures (including the conditional and the subjunctive), descriptions and opinions, for which many candidates were rewarded. On the other hand, candidates should be reminded not to be overambitious and try to use very complex structures, such as the conditional or the imperfect subjunctive, if they have not really mastered them.

Also, with regard to centres with a large number of candidates of different abilities covering the same tasks, candidates of higher ability should be encouraged to produce a wider variety of language so as to demonstrate manipulation of tenses and achieve their full potential. This has been an issue at times, where very able candidates lost marks by carrying out tasks such as Daily Routine or House, Home and Family entirely in the present tense.

Teachers are also reminded that candidates cannot achieve high marks for simply adding a few words or phrases to the stimulus material. Little or no credit can be given for simply copying from texts or changing a few words and teachers need to be aware of this when assessing candidates' work at this level. There were many instances of candidates changing just a few details in a pre-written letter (mostly about holidays or job applications) which made their candidates' work extremely repetitive. Candidates (especially the more able ones) should be encouraged to produce more individual work: it is not very credible when twenty candidates in the same centre have all spent their holidays in the Caribbean or have all gone to see the same film!

As in previous years, candidates performed better where effective stimuli and good preparation were in evidence. Many centres, however, are still not enclosing stimulus material along with candidates' work. This is a coursework requirement: for a fair and equitable moderation process to take place it is essential that centres send one copy of all stimulus material used, as it is at times difficult for moderators to identify the language produced independently by candidates and distinguish it from structures and vocabulary provided by the stimulus. Whatever resources are used to assist candidates in their coursework, be it a model answer, or a writing frame, or simply a list of questions to answer, teachers must enclose photocopies of the materials. Where a group of students has used the same stimulus material it is only necessary to include one copy.

Centres are also reminded that at least one third of the coursework should be produced under controlled conditions, and that controlled and uncontrolled pieces should be marked by the same criteria.

From an administrative point of view, centres need to ensure that all CF1 are correctly filled in, including topic titles and an indication of controlled/uncontrolled conditions, and that all candidates sign the CF1 cover sheet.

Each individual piece should also be labelled with the candidate's name and number and preferably the centre's name or number, so as to be identifiable by the moderator and when it is returned to the centre.

Coursework drafts and final version should be clearly labelled and drafts should not be annotated to inform candidates of specific errors. At times it was quite difficult for the moderators to distinguish between the draft and the final copy.

Candidates with the lowest and highest marks should be included in the sample submitted for moderation.

OPTEMs, filled in with the candidates' marks, must also be forwarded to the moderator.

In addition to this, it is essential that all centres adhere to the coursework receipt deadline, so that the moderation process can run effectively. Unfortunately, again this year there were a few instances of centres that sent their coursework well after the deadline.

Statistics

Paper 1F - Listening and Responding

Grade	Max. Mark	C	D	E	F	G	U
Raw Boundary Mark	50	36	29	22	16	10	0
Uniform Boundary Mark	59	50	40	30	20	10	0

Paper 1H - Listening and Responding

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	U
Raw Boundary Mark	50	135	129	123	117	114	112	0
Uniform Boundary Mark	90	80	70	60	50	40	35	0

Paper 2F - Speaking

Grade	Max. Mark	C	D	E	F	G	U
Raw Boundary Mark	50	27	22	18	14	10	0
Uniform Boundary Mark	59	50	40	30	20	10	0

Paper 2H - Speaking

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	U
Raw Boundary Mark	50	140	134	128	123	117	114	0
Uniform Boundary Mark	90	80	70	60	50	40	35	0

Paper 3F - Reading and Responding

Grade	Max. Mark	C	D	E	F	G	U
Raw Boundary Mark	50	34	28	22	17	12	0
Uniform Boundary Mark	59	50	40	30	20	10	0

Paper 3H - Reading and Responding

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	U
Raw Boundary Mark	50	134	130	126	123	116	112	0
Uniform Boundary Mark	90	80	70	60	50	40	35	0

Paper 4F - Writing

Grade	Max. Mark	C	D	E	F	G	U
Raw Boundary Mark	50	36	30	24	19	14	0
Uniform Boundary Mark	59	50	40	30	20	10	0

Paper 4H - Writing

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	U
Raw Boundary Mark	50	136	132	128	125	120	117	0
Uniform Boundary Mark	90	80	70	60	50	40	35	0

Paper 4C - Written Coursework

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Raw Boundary Mark	60	51	45	39	33	27	21	15	9	0
Uniform Boundary Mark	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	10	0

Overall Subject Boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Total Uniform Mark	360	320	280	240	200	160	120	80	40	0

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code UG 016677 Summer 2005

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications
Alternatively, you can contact Customer Services at www.edexcel.org.uk/ask or on 0870 240 9800

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH

