GCSE

Edexcel GCSE

Italian (1237)

This Examiners' Report relates to Mark
Scheme Publication code: UG018069

Summer 2006

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.

Contents

Paper 1F Listening and Responding

Questions 1 - 10, 'A scuola' were very well answered by the majority of the candidates with over 90% of candidates recognising most of the items. In question 3, 'disegno' was sometimes not recognised by the very weakest of candidates.

Question 11, 'Animali' proved a challenging question type and candidates lost marks on this. The target grade was G, as the language on the transcript was fairly straightforward, but candidates were confused as to where to place the crosses as there were like and dislike columns.

Question 12, 'Personalità' was well tackled by foundation candidates, even though target grade was C. The question contained some fairly sophisticated language, both in the transcript and the written matches on the question paper. 'Pensa solo a se stesso' in 12ii) was the most frequently misunderstood answer at this level, with only 56% of candidates choosing the correct match. Question 12iii) was the best answered section, with 78% securing the correct answer of 'intelligente' to match up with the transcript 'è così bravo negli studi e mi aiuta con i compiti'.

Question 13, 'Viaggio in treno' proved quite a challenge for candidates at foundation level, despite the fact that it was a multiple choice with very limited reading material on the question paper. It is thought that weaker candidates do not have the confidence to make the correct choice nor the linguistic sophistication to reject the other options. In 13a), 'questa mattina' was not often correctly matched with 'oggi'. Questions b, c and d were more successfully answered, but e and f had only a 30% success rate.

Question 14, 'Il cibo' was extremely well tackled even by the very weakest candidates.

Question 15, 'Sport'
This question was well answered by candidates at foundation level, with good recognition of most of the language both on the tape and question paper.

Question 16, 'Una domenica tipica' was well answered even at foundation level and it is very pleasing to see most candidates understand this level of language and be able to take good notes from the tape. The most commonly misunderstood section was iv) Ora del pranzo, where candidates answered either something like 'mangiare' or wrote the time wrongly. The numbers 1.00 were fully acceptable, but some candidates tried to write this out in words and made the mistake of missing out the apostrophe, which changed the time 'l'una' to the word 'luna' so significantly altering the meaning. Sometimes candidates lost marks by writing the right answer on the wrong line, which is a common error and very easily done with the added pressure of listening to the tape and writing at the same time

Questions 17 – 19, 'Local Area'. The questions in English on the last section of the Foundation paper are targeted at grade E and the language is kept as simple as possible. Whether candidates are tired by the time they reach this section or whether they do not have enough practice with this question type is not clear, but on the whole, this section proved more of a challenge than was expected. Question 17a was well answered by most candidates, with the majority also recognising 'mi piace molto' for 17b. 'Tanto da fare', which was needed to answer 17c, proved much more challenging, however, and only 43% of candidates wrote the correct response here. In question 18, most candidates were able to supply one activity, but not two, maybe because they failed to recognise 'negozi' and 'vado in centro'. In question 18b, 'costa molto', however, was well understood, but 18c 'è interessante solo guardare' was more difficult. In question 19, candidates often mistook 'campagna' for camping and 19b was only correctly answered by 30% of candidates.

Paper 1H Listening and Responding

Question 1, 'Viaggio in treno'. This question was very well answered at higher level. In section b, some chose the wrong time, and sections e and f were answered less well by the weaker candidates even at higher level.

Question 2, 'Personalità' was very well answered at higher level, showing a good level of deductive skills and linguistic sophistication on the part of the candidates.

Question 3, 'Cerco amici' was well answered by the more able candidates, but proved a challenge for the weaker ones. Sections iii) and iv) were found to be the hardest, perhaps because candidates did not recognise 'gattina' or relate 'sud d'Italia' with 'Sicilia o regioni meridionali'. Section vi) also proved hard, and the question paper wording 'lo stesso posto' was maybe not understood by some candidates.

Question 4, 'Sport'
This question was extremely well answered by candidates at higher level, with good recognition of most of the language both on the tape and question paper. The majority of candidates at this level were able to score full marks on this question.

Question 5 'Una domenica tipica'. This question was very well answered indeed, with many of the stronger candidates scoring full marks here too. Sometimes even Higher Level candidates lost marks by writing the right answer on the wrong line. This is a common error and very easily done with the added pressure of listening to the tape and writing at the same time. The most commonly misunderstood section was iv) Ora del pranzo, where candidates either answered something like 'mangiare' or wrote the time wrongly. The numbers 1.00 were fully acceptable, but some candidates tried to write this out in words and made the mistake of missing out the apostrophe, which changed the time 'l'una' to the word 'luna' so significantly altering the meaning.

Question 6, 'Problemi a EuroDisney,' was a challenging question for even the most able candidates. The most difficult sections were c and d where only 35% of candidates picked the correct answers. This question was aimed at the higher grades and it certainly stretched candidates at the top end of the spectrum. Very careful preparation in the five minute reading period, analysing the question paper and working out the meanings and nuances in the choices would help in future.

Question 7, 'Ragazzi, a tavolo'. This question was well answered, on the whole, with able candidates often scoring full marks. Once again, time spent on prediction and preparation for this type of question is very well spent as many answers could be determined by logic before hearing the tape.

Questions 8 – 10, 'Milly Carlucci talks about healthy eating. This question is always aimed at A* candidates and was true to form once again this year as it proved a great challenge to all but the most able of candidates. 50% of candidates got question 8a right, even though the answer required the element of staying healthy together with looking good. Candidates who only supplied one element in their answer were penalised for this. It is worth noting that precision in answers is required to score on this A* question. Question 8b required candidates to note more than that she only liked fruit and vegetables, they needed to include that they had a very important place in her diet or that she ate a great deal of them to gain the mark here.

All sections of question 9 proved to be the biggest challenge in this part of the paper. Only the very strongest candidates were able to access this and provide precise answers, which is to be expected for the A* target grade. In question 9a, several candidates took a guess at the answer saying 'they tasted nice' or she liked the fruit with milk, instead of giving the required answer of eating 2 fruits, or 2 kiwis, or 2 of the same sort of fruit with her cereal. Very few candidates were able to pick out the Italian 'stagione' which was required for the correct answer to question 9b. Question 9c was answered better, with 44% of candidates gaining a mark here. Many answers were too general, saying only that she drank water without adding a qualifier of either 'lots of water', or that it had lemon in it. Here water with lemon juice was accepted for a mark. Only 14% of candidates gave the correct answer to question 9d, which was that the vegetables could be either raw or cooked.

Question 10 was much more accessible to the middle and even the lower range of abilities, with 65% of candidates getting question 10a right. Question 10b was also well answered, with a few incorrect stabs at an answer, including the fact that some wrongly deduced that Patrick would not sit at table with the rest of the family. Perhaps this was because on the tape it refers to 'la ribellione a tavola' and candidates here wrongly assumed this to refer to the actual table rather than eating habits. Question 10c scored 73% correct answers, although amongst some of the incorrect ones was 'volley ball' quoted as an activity, probably mistaking the word 'volte' in 'due volte alla settimana' for the sport of volley ball.

The general conclusions which can be drawn from this year's listening papers are that candidates have been well prepared and are performing true to their levels. Teachers and students had chosen the entry levels wisely, as few candidates entered at Higher Level really struggled with the difficulty of the paper. Maybe questions with answers in English could be practised more in preparation for the examination, as well as multiple choice style questions. Candidates should be advised to use their preparation time very well indeed, both at the beginning of the examination, before the tape is played, and in the pauses before each question.

Paper 2 Speaking

This year again, examiners commented on the high standards of the majority of candidates. It is always a pleasure to listen to students able to converse in Italian so well. With very few exceptions, they were entered appropriately at Higher or Foundation Tier, which gave them the opportunity to perform optimally. Also to the credit of their Teacher-Examiners was their thorough preparation for the requirements of the test.

The format of the examination is now familiar, and as was the case last year, good examining technique allowed most candidates to fully display their skills in the role-plays and the conversation. It is obvious that allowing sufficient time beforehand for Teacher-Examiners to become familiar with the handbook is vital to ensure a smooth conduct of the tests.

Fewer problems were reported with role-plays this year, showing that comments from previous years have been noted. In all role-plays, it is important that Teacher-Examiners do not omit any utterances, and keep to the rubrics in the handbook. Whilst repeating a question is allowed, rephrasing it means that the answer cannot be credited, as examiners must ensure consistency of marking across all the candidates.

In role-play B, should the student have anticipated the unpredictable question, it must be asked nevertheless, so that the candidate gets credited for his/her reply, and also does not become confused with the sequence of the rest of the role-play. For example, in role-play B2, if a candidate said: *Che tipo di pizza avete? Vorrei una pizza con prosciutto e funghi,* the Teacher-Examiner should still continue with: *Abbiamo tutti i tipi. Quale preferisce?* as per the script.

In role-play C, bullet points guide the sequence of the role-play, whilst the stimulus material provides ideas for expansion. In order to score the highest marks, candidates must not only communicate all the points, but also show that they are able to develop their replies. For example, in role-play C6, if a candidate said: *1. Vorrei informazioni. 2. Livello due.. 3. A scuola. 4. Quanto costa? 5. Un mese,* s/he would have covered all the points correctly but without expansion. A better approach would be along these lines: *1. Buona sera. Chiamo perché vorrei avere qualche informazioni sui corsi di lingua italiana, per favore. 2. Non sono sicuro/a, ma forse livello tre o quattro. 3. L'ho imparato a scuola in Inghilterra per tre anni. Mi piace molto questa lingua. 4. Mi può dire quanto costa? 5. Per un mese, penso.*

In the conversations, it was good to hear many interesting discussions on a variety of topics, from students of all ages. Candidates who performed best were those who produced extended replies, using a wide range of language and tenses to talk about their experiences and opinions. However, the timing of the conversations was not always adhered to. Too much or too little time spent on either topic may adversely affect the candidates' marks.

Another area for improvement is the administration of the tests. Examination Officers should check that the recording of the tests is clear, that the correct paperwork is completed and forwarded, and that the cassettes as well as their boxes are clearly labelled, as explained in the Teacher-Examiner's handbook. This is particularly important for candidates who 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.
A3 – *francobollo* and *cartolina* was not always known.
A4 – *È lontano* was not always known.

Role-play B

Few problems were reported.
B1 – some candidates had difficulties with the unpredictable question, saying <u>what</u> they wanted to eat rather than <u>where</u>.
B2 – a small number of candidates had difficulties asking *Quando siete aperti?* or words to that effect.
B3 – a few candidates had problems with *finisce*. Mature students often laughed when asked their age (some ladies were definitely 21, whilst others went for the senior citizen discount!)
B4 – some asked for a sum of money not shown in the pictures. A few did not understand *documento.*
B5 – a few candidates had problems with *profumo*, although they could have chosen another alternative.
B6 – some asked for *scarpe* instead of *sciarpa.*

Role-play C

Although many candidates expanded their answers very well, some did not achieve the top marks as they offered minimal sentences. However, fewer problems were reported this year.
C1 – the unpredictable *E per i pasti, che cosa desidera fare?* was not always understood. Many gave good extended replies to the second unpredictable question.
C2 – many students made good use of the stimulus material to expand their replies.
C3 – here too, many candidates used the stimulus material very well to expand their replies to the first unpredictable question.
C4 – the cue *Fotografie?* was not always understood. Marks were awarded both for asking if photographs were sold, or for a book containing photos.
C5 – some candidates thought the first unpredictable question was to do with describing the trousers.
C6 – most gave correct utterance or replies, but generally less expansion.

Conversation

Examiners remarked on many candidates' excellent and interesting conversations, both at Foundation and Higher levels. A great majority of Teacher-Examiners asked a good range of questions, allowing their students to use different tenses and structures, and express and justify their opinions.
In a few cases, the first topic was little more than a pre-learnt monologue. Whilst candidates can introduce their chosen topic for up to a minute, questions encouraging spontaneous developed responses are needed.
Similarly, using exclusively the suggested questions from the handbook usually restricts the candidates' extended answers.
As shown in the marking criteria, the highest language marks cannot be awarded to candidates using the present tense only, however fluent they might be.

Note to Centres

The following statement appears in the Information Manual for 2006/2007.

Please note that Awarding Bodies are currently reviewing the purpose and format of feedback given to centres regarding internally assessed units. Edexcel has adopted a standard online feedback form E9 which offers centres improved feedback with results via Edexcel Online. We are no longer able to provide centres with subject-specific feedback on the papers which are not classed as "internally assessed".

Summer 2006 is the last examination for which Edexcel will provide U9L reports on Paper 2 Orals. We will continue, however, to give feedback via the standard E9 reports on the coursework paper 4C.

Paper 3F Reading and Responding

The number of candidates entered at this level remains a lot 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.9 and 10), which resulted in the loss of some marks.

Question 1
This was reasonably well done, but many candidates were not familiar with *abbigliamento* and not even *scarpe*.

Question 2
This was generally answered well although a few candidates incorrectly chose C (*occhiali da sole)*, often not recognising *valigia* in the text*.*

Question 3
This question was answered reasonably well on the whole but the majority of candidates failed to make the connection between *negozio di scarpe* in the text and *commessa* in (ii) and between *insegnante* in the text and *scuola* in (iv).

Question 4
This *question* proved quite demanding for some Foundation candidates. The majority coped well with (i) and often with (iii) but most struggled to link *figlio unico* in the text with *non ha fratelli* in (ii) or *single* in the text with *non è sposato* in (v). *Calcio* was often not recognised as a synonym for *pallone*. Some tried to guess, for example "giocare a amici/giocare a film", which were incorrect from the grammar point of view and also did not correspond to the text. Most candidates at this level did not realise that an awareness of grammar rules and structures might have helped them in their choices. This type of question tests not only the candidates' understanding of the text but also their knowledge of grammar.

Question 5
This question was strangely answered comparatively better at Foundation Level than at the Higher Tier. Some candidates, however, confused *ore 7:30* in the text with *alle sei e mezza* in (ii)were misled by *continuazione della visita* in the text, thus incorrectly opting for C in (iii), or confused *70 euro* in the text with *sessanta euro* in (v). This demonstrates a poor knowledge of basic numbers.

Question 6
This was a fairly challenging question for the Foundation Tier but most candidates coped extremely well with it. The only parts that appeared slightly more demanding were (i), where most candidates failed to link *fidanzata* in the text with *ragazza*, and (ii), where many failed to match *vestiti* in the text with *abbigliamento*.

Question 7

The vast majority of candidates seemed to be very familiar with the vocabulary relating to places of interest in town, so this question was generally well done, with the vast majority gaining full marks. The only part that was answered incorrectly at times was (iv), as some candidates were not familiar with *duomo* or else did not recognise the picture.

Question 8

This question was also answered very well, with just a few candidates failing to recognise words like *barba*, *baffi* or *occhiali* in the descriptions of the male characters. The vast majority was familiar with the vocabulary relating to the description of eyes and hair.

Question 9

Most candidates managed to score at least a couple of points in this question. Many were able to name the facilities available at the hotel, but in (b) most candidates were not familiar with *prima colazione*. Disappointingly, months and basic numbers are still frequently not known, therefore (c), *June*, was often mistaken for another month, and *sedici* was sometimes not known. As for (e) only a very small number of candidates answered correctly with *mezza pensione* while the others resorted to guessing (family room/a gift/half pension, some even included pensioners in the price!).

Question 10

Again, most candidates managed to score at least a couple of points in this question. However, yet again a surprising number of candidates were not familiar with the days of the week and (c) elicited all possible days. In (a) many candidates lost marks by answering with a month rather than the season, possibly not recognising *estate*, while in (d) some mistook *dieci giorni* for 10 "weeks". Surprisingly (b), which was perceived to be the most demanding part of this question, was answered well.

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 q.9 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 *negozio di scarpe* and *commessa* in (ii).

Question 2
This question was generally answered well but again, even at this tier, a small proportion of candidates struggled with (ii) (possibly *figlio unico* not known), (iv) and (v), as in the Foundation Tier, although the question was based on straightforward synonyms. Candidates are reminded that this type of question tests not only their understanding of the text but also their knowledge of grammar, especially agreements.

Question 3
This was done reasonably well by the majority of candidates, with most scoring at least four out of five marks. A few possibly failed to understand *un uomo straniero* in (e).

Question 4
Most candidates managed to score high marks in this question. A few were not familiar with *navigare su Internet* in (i) while others surprisingly failed to match *praticare* with *uno sport*. The weakest candidates simply resorted to copying random words from the text.

Question 5
This was a fairly challenging question but most candidates coped quite well with it. The most demanding part appeared to be (v), as some candidates were thrown either by *entrambi* in the text and/or by *sia...che* in the question.

Question 6
This was another challenging question, as it is a grammar test as well as a comprehension exercise. Most candidates coped well with it but (ii) and (v) proved a bit tricky: in (ii) some were possibly misled by the mention of *fidanzato* in the first part of the sentence and thus opted incorrectly for G, while in (v) *la partita* was not associated with *lo stadio*. The weaker ones simply resorted to guessing.

Question 7
This question was generally well done at this level but even at the Higher Tier some candidates failed to link *fidanzata* in the text with *ragazza* in (i) and *vestiti* in the text with *abbigliamento* in (ii)

Question 8
This question was strangely answered comparatively better at Foundation Level than at the Higher Tier, with many Foundation candidates scoring better than Higher Tier candidates! Even at the Higher Level many candidates confused *ore 7:30* in the text with *alle sei e mezza* in (ii), or were misled by *continuazione della visita* in the text, thus incorrectly opting for C in (iii), or confused *70 euro* in the text with *sessanta euro* in (v). This demonstrates a poor knowledge of basic numbers, even at the Higher tier.

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. As usual, weaker candidates were clearly simply guessing in parts, drawing from their general knowledge of environmental issues.
In (b) many candidates were unable to translate *periodi di immersione totale nella natura*, although a virtually literal translation was accepted in the mark scheme. Many simply translated it as "camps in nature/adventure camps/activity camps", which were too vague.
In (c) many failed to concentrate on *escursioni guidate* and thus wrote irrelevant information about other activities.
In (d) most candidates coped well with both points but some wrongly translated *vela* with "bicycle" (obviously getting confused with French).
In (e) many resorted to guessing, as they were unable to translate *raccolta dei rifiuti* (often simply translated as "don't litter" or even "recycle") while *attento uso di ogni risorsa* was not easily rendered in English (many incorrectly wrote "use every resource" or similar interpretations, ignoring the key word *attento*). *Un'alimentazione sana* was strangely often ignored.
In (f) most candidates managed to score at least one point but many were unable to clearly express the difference between *Campi Avventura* and a traditional holiday and simply picked on key words but in the wrong context.
(g) was generally answered correctly.

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 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 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 very well, with a variety of vocabulary relating to food and drink or even Italian dishes as from a restaurant menu. This is obviously a well-prepared topic. Marks were sometimes lost through inclusion of non-Italian items of vocabulary (mostly French or English) or words which were spelled too incorrectly to be recognizable by a sympathetic native speaker.

Question 2
The majority of candidates responded reasonably well, as in terms of communication they were able to complete most sentences. However, many failed to achieve full marks for communication because not all sentences were completed: in (a) a surprising number of candidates were not able to produce *doccia* or even *bagno,* also accepted by the mark scheme.
Apart from (a), vocabulary was generally appropriate with fairly accurate spelling. *Scuola* was the most commonly misspelled word, although generally recognisable. *Panino* was also problematic at times, even though the mark scheme accepted the English word "sandwich", as it is often used in Italian as well.
The main difficulties were with the verb forms. In terms of grammar quite a few candidates were not able to form correctly the first person of the verb (although they should be familiar with it even at this level) and very few knew the irregular verb *faccio*.

Question 3
This question was completed satisfactorily, although with some ambiguity at times.
Most candidates were able to state the date of their arrival, although often not in the correct Italian format, to describe what they look like (but often without a correct verb), to say what they wanted to do whilst in Italy and what programmes they like on TV. However, verbs again caused the most problems, as many candidates were unable to produce simple verb forms such as *arrivo* for the first task and some did not even use *sono* or *ho* in their physical description. On the other hand, most candidates were familiar with *mi piace,* which was often used to answer both the third and fourth bullet points (activities in Italy/favourite TV programme).
The last bullet point regarding TV often elicited no more than the English name of their favourite programme.
Accuracy was variable, although on the whole appropriate for the task, but syntax was more problematic, especially in the physical descriptions, where word order was often anglicised.

Question 4 (a)

This was by far the more popular choice of the two questions. By definition this overlap question is quite challenging for Foundation candidates but the majority completed it at least adequately.

The main difficulties centred on the range of tenses required to cover the tasks. The best answers coped well with the present, the past and a simple 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 candidates had problems in expressing what type of film they like/dislike, often giving genres of films in English, such as "action", and some omitted to explain the reason for their like/dislike (and therefore not expressing an opinion, which is required by the overlap question).

Some described their last trip to the cinema in terms of food and drink, i.e. *ho bevuto una Coca Cola/dopo sono andato in pizzeria* (with varying degrees of accuracy), which however was accepted by the mark scheme. Judging by the amount of candidates who have seen the Da Vinci Code Dan Brown must be coining it in!

Question 4 (b)

Clearly the minority choice, this question was also fairly well done by those who opted for it, although many neglected to say how they travel or why they enjoyed their trip.

The answers were usually about a visit to a museum or an exchange trip.

Some responses unfortunately were nothing more than pre-learnt holiday accounts (especially those written by adult candidates) and therefore were largely irrelevant. Some candidates managed to display a range of tenses, including the imperfect and the conditional (*vorrei/mi piacerebbe*).

Paper 4H Writing

Question 1 (a)
This question was the most popular choice even at Higher Level. It elicited coherent responses, mostly longer than required.
The majority of candidates showed the ability to manipulate a wide range of tenses, including the present, perfect, imperfect and the conditional, which was needed for the final task.
Some candidates overlooked the reason why they like a particular type of film, which unfortunately caused the loss of a few marks.

Question 1 (b)
This question was a minority choice even at this 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 conditional.
Most showed an ability to manipulate the language to carry out the required tasks.

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 the best or worst party they have ever been to, an explanation of the reasons why they liked it/disliked it and their views on the importance of parties for young people and how best to organise one. It was a challenging task which produced a wide variety of responses with some candidates choosing to narrate the worst rather than the best party of their life with much humour in it. Some candidates recounted a festival rather than a party, which was also acceptable.
Again, a variety of tenses was displayed, although more complex structures like the conditional in the last bullet point proved difficult for the weaker candidates. However, many managed to avoid using it resorting instead to *bisogna* or *è necessario* or *si deve/devi* (instead of the more sophisticated *si dovrebbe*) *or* "*Per la festa perfetta mi piacerebbe/vorrei*", just a little wide of the mark, yet still mostly covering the last bullet point
Other displayed very complex, albeit pr-learnt, phrases with the subjunctive and the conditional such as "*se avessi molti soldi …*", but not always correctly.

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. The task left much scope to imagination, as candidates could tell any story they liked provided it arose from the stimulus and covered all the bullet points. Some candidates lost a few markes because they omitted either their thoughts/reaction when they found the wallet, or, more often, the consequences of their actions.

The ability to narrate, using the perfect and the imperfect tenses, was paramount in this task along with some understanding of pronouns (e.g.: "*L'ho trovato*"). Indeed, top-grade candidates showed that they had mastered these structures, while others were not competent enough in their sequence of tenses to describe what they did and use the reported speech correctly. Overall, however, it was handled at least satisfactorily.

This question produced many delightful responses, especially those dealing with the moral dilemma of returning a fat wallet belonging to a stranger instead of going on a shopping spree. However, the majority reached the conclusion that countless, sleepless nights are not worth a few extra pounds and preferred to opt for a good night's sleep and a clear conscience. The less imaginative candidates simply recounted how they had taken it to the police station and handed it in but there were some great examples of finding famous peoples' wallets and getting free tickets to concerts/football matches, mafia hitmen's/drug dealers' wallets and even finding true love!

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 1b and even q.2a some wrote about a holiday, which was irrelevant to the tasks.

- *Bene, buono* and *bello* are often confused and used incorrectly. *Divertente* is often the only opinion that is offered about anything, be it a trip or a film or a party.

- Most candidates did not seem confident in the use of pronouns.

- *Mi è piaciuto* is often produced inaccurately, eve at the Higher tier.

- 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 film reviews. 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 and therefore the piece titles should be more focused: this would avoid the inclusion of the same material in more than one piece of work. Overlap also occurred when a centre submitted two or even three pieces taken from the same topic area, for example a piece with a description of the family, a piece with a description of the house and a piece about daily life: all three are part of "House, Home and Family" and marks can only be awarded for one of the three pieces.Centres also need to remember that the title of the candidate's piece of coursework should be indicated both on the CF1 form and on the candidate's script. The topic title, although helpful, is too generic for the moderator to evaluate the relevance of the piece to be marked if the title is missing.

With regard to the length of each unit, centres should submit only one piece per topic and not two or three. When candidates produce more than one piece per topic it is up to the teacher, and not the moderator, to select the best one for each topic. Also, candidates can achieve full marks whilst keeping within the recommended word limits. This year some candidates submitted work containing over 1000 or even 1500 words, which is excessive and unnecessary, although they have not been penalised for it.

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 House, Home and Family or a holiday brochure entirely in the present tense. The nature of such tasks is self-penalising.

Teachers are reminded that the marks awarded for Communication and Content are not merely related to the number of words in the task or the relevance to the title but closely depend on the quality of the language, as described in the mark scheme. Therefore, if the language causes ambiguity or if is too simple (for example no variety of tenses), full marks cannot be awarded even if the task is completed.

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.

This links up with the issue of the stimulus, which is often not provided. Many centres 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. It is also necessary to assess the relevance of the piece. 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. Some centres are still using outdates CF1 sheets, which do not require the candidate's signature. In fact all CF1s must now be signed by the candidates. Updated forms are available online.

Each individual piece should be labelled with the candidate's name and number and preferably the centre's name and/or number, so as to be identifiable by the moderator, even without the CF1 form, 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	35	28	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	35	29	23	27	14	12	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	29	25	21	17	13	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	35	30	25	21	15	12	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	34	29	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	35	31	27	23	18	15	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

edexcel
advancing learning, changing lives

A PEARSON COMPANY