

GCSE

Examiners' Report

**GCSE
Italian (1237)**

Summer 2004

edexcel 

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

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

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

September 2004

Publications Code UG015435

All the material in this publication is copyright
© London Qualifications Ltd 2004

Contents

1.	Paper 1F/H Examiners' Report	1
2.	Paper 2F & 2H Examiners' Report	4
3.	Paper 3F Examiners' Report	6
4.	Paper 3H Examiners' Report	8
5.	Paper 4F Examiners' Report	10
6.	Paper 4H Examiners' Report	11
7.	General Comments on Paper 4F & 4H	13
8.	Paper 4C Moderators' Report	14
9.	Statistical Information	16

Paper 1F/H – Listening and Responding

Both the Foundation and Higher Listening papers were very well answered indeed this year by the majority of candidates. It was evident that a great deal of hard work had gone into the preparation for this exam by both candidates and teachers. The paper was accessible to candidates at both levels and there were very few examples of questions which were not attempted at all. Weaker candidates benefited from not having to write answers in Italian this year, which also contributed to the accessibility of the papers. There was a fairly high 'feel good' factor at both levels on the papers as all except the very weakest of candidates were able to tackle the majority of the questions with a fair degree of success. There was much evidence this year of wise use of the five minute reading period. Many candidates had made copious notes on their question papers and had anticipated the tape script intelligently. They had prepared themselves by writing in vocabulary and this probably contributed to the successful answering of the questions.

Paper 1F

Q1–10

These questions were very well answered by most candidates. Some experienced difficulties with Q8 where they heard *acqua*, but did not connect to *minerale* and so the most common error was to opt for answer A rather than C.

Q11

This question proved quite straightforward for most candidates, although a surprising number did not score full marks. The most commonly missed or wrongly ticked questions were Q11(iii) *faccio un giro in bicicletta* often mistaking it for C: horse riding. Q11(iv) *faccio i compiti* was also sometimes missed.

Q12

This question was surprisingly well answered even by foundation candidates, despite the fairly sophisticated language used. The most common errors were in Q12(i) where candidates failed to associate *il prezzo* in the transcript with *il costo dei prodotti* in the question. Q12(v) was also sometimes missed, with candidates who failed to associate *a dicembre* on the question paper with *Natale* on the transcript.

Q13

The language and vocabulary in this question was once again quite accessible to most candidates, and it was pleasing to read many fully correct scripts. The questions most commonly missed were Q13(a) where candidates did not link *una ragazza bruna* on the tape with *ha i capelli scuri* on the question paper. Q13(e) was also sometimes missed, as candidates did not make the connection between *ama la musica* on the question paper and *mi piace tanto suonare la chitarra* on the transcript.

Q14-18

This section was more demanding for weaker candidates who found the language used more challenging. The most common errors were on Q14 and 15. On Q14, candidates were required to link *estate* on the question paper with *agosto* on the transcript. It is understandable that weaker candidates failed to make this connection in a listening examination when they have little time to consider the options. In Q15, candidates wrongly linked *automobili* on the question paper with *autobus* on the transcript and answered E instead of A. Q17 and 18 were nearly always answered correctly. Many candidates seemed to get into the swing of the question type after starting off with some incorrect answers, getting better as the examination progressed.

Q19-22

This section proved demanding for some candidates, who were not familiar with the lexis for work and jobs. At Foundation Level, the vocabulary *pullman* and *autista*, both needed for Q19, was fairly demanding. The same was true of Q20, where candidates were required to link *infermiera* with *lavoro con i malati*. Q21 proved easier for the majority of candidates, as they were required to link *veterinario* with *animali*, but Q22 once again proved harder as they were asked to associate *commessa* with *negozio*. Even some Higher candidates struggled with this question which required very specific knowledge of vocabulary.

Q23-26

This last section on the Foundation listening paper, which is targeted at grade E, was answered extremely well by the vast majority of candidates, who showed that they had reached a good level of understanding of basic, spoken Italian during the course of their studies. There were a few problems with the very weakest candidates, however. In Q23(a) there were a few candidates who wrote *swimming* for what Valentina suggested doing, while the correct answer was *shopping* or *going to town*. A few candidates got the wrong day of the week or the wrong time. Most candidates answered Q24 correctly, with just a few taking wild guesses at the answer. In Q25(a), some candidates lost the mark for this by putting down that Valentina wanted to buy a computer instead of a computer game. Some of the weaker candidates failed to recognize the word *compleanno* on the tapescript, being required to answer Q25(b). Once again, some wild guesses at how Valentina could afford to do her shopping were given such as that she would *sell something*, some candidates even suggesting that she would *sell the piano*, linking this to the Italian *compleanno*. On the whole, it was only the weakest candidates who made these errors. Q26 did prove a little more challenging, although a variety of answers were deemed acceptable both to Q26(a) and Q26(c). In Q26(b) the price of *75 Euros*, was not always recognized.

Some candidates scored very high marks on the Foundation paper this year, suggesting that maybe they could have been entered for the higher paper. Teachers might like to look closely at the results and consider this option for next year.

Paper 1H

Q1 (see Foundation Level Q13)

Q2 (see Foundation Level Q12)

Q3

This question was well answered with many candidates scoring full marks. Some candidates lost points by placing more than one tick in the same row, so negating any correct tick in the same row. Q3(i) and Q3(ii) were most frequently wrongly answered.

Q4-8 (see Foundation Level Q14-18)

Q9-12 (see Foundation Level Q19-22)

Q13

This was a challenging question and a demanding question type, where candidates were required to decide not only if the statements were true or false, but if they were in fact in the text at all. However, it was amazingly well answered by well over half of the candidates, and is a great credit to their linguistic skills. The level of reading required to understand the questions was also quite high, but candidates used their deductive skills to good effect in identifying the correct answers. Q13(v) and Q13(vi) were most commonly incorrectly answered, but some of the stronger candidates were able to score full marks on this question.

Q14

Some of the weaker candidates failed to score well on this question – it is possible that they thought it was more complex than intended. Some candidates got into the rhythm of getting the correct answers after the first couple of questions. Many candidates once again, were able to gain full marks on this question. As in Q3, some candidates lost marks by placing two ticks in the same row. The language used in this question was designed to stretch the more able candidates, who responded well to the challenge.

Q15

This was deemed to be a challenging question with its rather unusual idea of computerized golf balls, and the target grade was A. It was very well answered by the candidates, with many scoring full marks. Some candidates wrongly ticked (vii) and (viii), wrongly assuming that all players had computers and that the ball stopped at the control room rather than communicating its arrival electronically to the control room. It is a great credit to the candidates that they were so well able to glean the correct response from such a complex notion.

Q16-19

This section was answered much more confidently and competently this year than similar sections in the past. The idea of length of schooling in Italy in comparison to other countries was not as challenging linguistically as some other sections, and there were often a number of acceptable answers for each item. This made the passage more accessible to candidates and there were few pitfalls in the precise expression of answers required. Q16 was well answered by the stronger candidates and also many of the weaker ones. Some made the mistake of quoting the wrong figures for the length of the summer holidays and lost marks because of this. Q17 was more complex in that it required two elements to gain full marks and some weaker candidates muddled their response with incorrect facts such as suggesting that in Europe many countries **only** had two weeks holiday, rather than that they had two weeks at other times of year. Some candidates failed to clarify whether it was in Italy that the summer holidays were longer, suggesting instead that it was in Europe. Q18 was challenging for average candidates, but some good candidates failed to score full marks here because they quoted the wrong figures. A precise number of hours was not required in the answer, so candidates should be warned only to quote statistics if required and then to be very accurate. In Q19, some candidates jumped to their own conclusions leading to such answers as that candidates should have longer holidays or shorter lesson times. This was the least well answered question on the paper. Many candidates failed to recognize *peggiora*, which at this level is challenging, but within what might be expected of A* candidates.

Paper 2F/H – Speaking

This year's examination provided ample evidence to show that teachers have adapted very well to the new specification which is now in the second year of examination. Standards remain high and candidates continue to be very well prepared for the requirements of the examination both at Higher and Foundation level. There were very few instances of candidates having been entered for the incorrect level of examination which is splendid evidence of the expertise and judgement displayed by their teachers.

The best-performing candidates are those that are able to expand in the C role-plays and to respond to a wide variety of questions. It remains a pleasure to be able to hear candidates discuss, in a language other than their mother tongue, a whole host of issues and experiences. Teachers should be commended for the time which they devote to ensuring that their candidates are able to respond in the speaking test.

As was the case last year, the removal of the ability to refer to dictionaries has meant that the amount of inappropriate and mispronounced vocabulary continues to be small which is encouraging.

A key area for improvement is the time which teachers spend in preparing for the tests. Teacher-examiners should ensure that they devote sufficient time to read thoroughly and familiarise themselves with the Oral Handbook and its instructions so that candidates are not unduly penalised because of mis-reading or neglecting certain commands or instructions. Even teachers who have been examining for many years can be caught out – hopefully examinations officers in centres will heed this advice and allow preparation time for teachers as well as for candidates.

Another area for teachers to consider is their attention to the rubric in all the role-plays, though most particularly with the unpredictable element in the B role-plays, and all of the rubrics for the C role-plays. It is not permitted for teachers to rephrase the rubric in any way – for the sake of consistency across the entire candidature for the examination it is essential that all candidates receive the same questions on the role-plays. If a candidate responds to a rephrased question their answer will not be credited. Similarly there is a tendency for teachers to refuse to accept a response which they know to be incorrect and to ask the question again in the hope that the candidate will come up with the correct answer on the second attempt. This serves no purpose since examiners are instructed to mark the first response which they hear.

Role-play A

A1 – *Colazione* often not known.

A5 – *Come si chiama?* often not known.

A6 – surprisingly some candidates were unable to state a room preference.

Role-play B

B3 – some candidates were unable to convey the notion of time for the second utterance, and the final utterance *Ask if you can leave your telephone number* did prove difficult for many.

B4 – showed the clear need for teachers to have quality preparation time before conducting the test since a fair number of teachers asked the question for utterance four rather than allowing the candidate to do so even though the teacher’s utterances are all printed in bold to avoid such confusion. This was a regrettable occurrence which did penalise some candidates.

B5 – candidates often offered *un ritorno* as a type of ticket, and *binario* was not known by a fair number of candidates.

Role-play C

Candidates did show that they were ready for the format of the C role-plays and indeed it was seldom the case that candidates failed to understand the unpredictable elements. However, the main shortcoming in this section of the examination was the failure of many candidates to expand in their utterances. This has been pointed out in several Examiners’ Reports in the past. The mark grids clearly state for 7-8 marks: ‘produces extended replies’ is a required element and that for 9-10 marks: ‘takes the initiative and expands’ is a required element. For example, in **C4** for utterance 1, a candidate who asks: *Vorrei delle informazioni sulla città* has shown no expansion and has indeed relied very heavily on the stimulus on the question card. A better answer would have been: *Vorrei delle informazioni sulla città perchè sono qui in vacanza e voglio vedere la regione*. Such an utterance shows the ability to expand and to take the initiative by supplying some additional information. Whilst it is understood that not all candidates will be able to supply such an answer, it is clear that many able candidates are either not being told to expand or not being given the opportunity to do so. The element of expansion is one of the features which distinguishes role-play C from role-play B. At the other end of the scale there is at times a tendency for the C role-play to develop into a mini-conversation which is clearly not desirable, particularly if the teacher-examiner is asking additional questions not included in the rubric.

The response to the C role-plays was consistent across the six questions available with no particularly significant areas of difficulty other than the issue referred to above.

Conversation

Here candidates continue to perform well. Coverage of the conversation topics is balanced and candidates are used to the kind of question forms which the teacher examiners pose: this represents an improvement from last year – teachers have clearly become more familiar with the nature of the prescribed conversation topic areas. Teachers give particular emphasis to the requirement to give their candidates the opportunity to display their skills with various tense forms, even with the weakest of candidates, and this is most commendable. Many candidates are able to express opinions and are given the opportunity to expand and to justify statements. The grammatical knowledge of candidates is, on the whole, good. It remains pleasing to hear candidates able to converse in the foreign language over such a wide range of topics, showing that the teaching of Italian remains strong in the United Kingdom.

There is evidence of ‘over-preparation’ for the first topic, which at times is a monologue with next to no questions from the teacher-examiner, and then a move to a second topic on which the candidate is unable to say very much. Whilst examiners will listen to a prepared monologue, it is not good practice – it is better for teachers to prepare their candidates to respond to a range of questions on the first topic – which of course is known prior to entering the examination room – rather than to allow a pre-learnt speech. The mark grids give useful pointers to the skills and knowledge which the candidates should be aware of.

Paper 3F – Reading and Responding

Examiners' Report

The number of candidates entered at this level remains proportionately lower than those for Paper 3H but most candidates seemed to have been entered at the correct level. The paper was accessible to the vast majority so that almost all candidates were able to attempt every question. There were very few instances of candidates failing to read the rubric carefully and answering in the wrong language (Q7, 10 & 11), which resulted in the loss of some marks.

Q1

This was generally well done, with only *occhiali da sole* and *costume da bagno* not being recognised at times. Strangely enough a lot of wrong answers for this question used answer F (*pallone*) which could not be correct as it was used in the example!

Q2

This question was generally answered well.

Q3

This was generally well done but fruit vocabulary caused some problems for weaker candidates: *marmellata di fragole*, perhaps interpreted as *marmalade*, led to many incorrectly ticking A (lemon) or I (orange). Predictably many candidates confused *uova* with *uva* and incorrectly ticked F. Others lost marks by ticking more than five boxes.

Q4

This question proved slightly more demanding, particularly Q4(iii), with many candidates opting for D, perhaps not understanding *sport acquatici*.

Q5

This was answered reasonably well on the whole, but many candidates missed the explanation of the word *criceto* contained in the text (and obviously were not familiar with it), which obviously affected their answers. Other candidates did not understand the meaning of *appartiene* in Q5(iii), which prompted them to tick the wrong column.

Q6

This was as usual a challenging question for the Foundation tier: sections Q6(iv) (*scrive*) and Q6(v) (*triste*) were often answered successfully (perhaps because text messages play such an important part in youth culture nowadays!) but the first part proved more demanding. This type of question tested not only the candidates' understanding of the text but also their knowledge of grammar.

Q7

This question proved quite demanding for Foundation candidates. A surprisingly large number of candidates answered *Bologna* for *Nazionalità*. Many were not sure whether *Luogo di nascita* meant *place* of birth or *date* of birth and put down both, therefore gaining no marks. For *Professione*, although the word *attore* was in the text, many candidates answered incorrectly (for example with *pubblicità* or in English). The *Passatempi* section was usually well done. Sadly, a few candidates again failed to score any marks at all for this question because they answered in English, particularly *Italian*, *actor* and *Rome*.

Q8

This question was quite straightforward in terms of vocabulary but many candidates failed to identify *cellulare* and *orologio*.

Q9

Most candidates seemed to be familiar with the vocabulary relating to clothes, so this question was generally well done.

Q10

Most candidates managed to score at least a couple of points in this question, but in Q10(b) *Napoli* was very common, which was rejected as it does not adhere to the rubric. In Q10(c) many put *6 days*, incorrectly counting the days from 16 to 22 July and showing that *settimana* was not recognized. Disappointingly, basic numbers are still frequently not known, therefore Q10(d) was often answered as *17* or even *36* (ovens, not cooks). As for Q10(e), many resorted to guessing, failing to recognise either *fragole* or *zucchero*. A very small number of candidates failed to score any marks at all in Q10 because they answered in Italian.

Q11

Again, most candidates managed to score at least a couple of points in this question, as it relied heavily on cognates, but in Q11(a) the majority did not understand *genitori*, often translated as *janitors*, and in Q11(c) *materie di studio* was often misinterpreted as *materials*. A very small number of candidates failed to score any marks at all in Q11 because they answered in Italian.

Paper 3H – Reading and Responding

Examiners' Report

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 Q6, 7 & 9 in the wrong language, thus losing some marks.

Q1

This was generally answered well by Higher candidates.

Q2

This question was also generally answered well, although even some Higher candidates were not familiar with *appartiene* in Q2(iii). Q2(v) often caused problems given that the answer was found in one of the more complex sentences in the text.

Q3

This was answered reasonably well, though some candidates were possibly confused by *in giro* in Q3(i) and by the slightly more complex phrasing of Q3(iii). A few also failed to link *mi preparo il pranzo* with *deve cucinare*.

Q4

This was done reasonably well by the majority of candidates, in spite of some demanding vocabulary. The most common wrong ticks included Q4(e), probably due to candidates overlooking the word *sposati* in the text, and Q4(h), where *aspetto fisico* was probably not understood. Others also incorrectly associated *televisione* in Q4(a) with *agenzia pubblicitaria* in the text.

Q5

This was a fairly challenging question which was answered better at Higher level but still proved demanding in parts, especially Q5(i) where *studente* was often incorrectly chosen instead of *amico* even by good candidates. This type of question is a grammar test as well as a comprehension exercise but at times it appears to be treated as a simple grammar exercise without taking into the account the content of the letter, which is, of course, crucial to some answers, as the candidates' choices in the box afforded more than one grammatical option for each answer.

Q6

This question was generally well done at this level.

Q7

Most candidates coped well with Q7(a) and Q7(b), which were simple to lift from the text but Q7(c)-(e) proved slightly more difficult, with wrong answers being due mainly to the fact that candidates had extracted irrelevant parts from the text. For example, in Q7(c) some only wrote *la lingua*, omitting the crucial word *italiana*, while in Q7(e) they omitted *cibi*, simply writing *marocchini o cinesi*, which to an Italian would sound like the children can eat Chinese and Moroccan **people!** In Q7(d) quite a few candidates misunderstood the question and answered where **in the text** the school was mentioned (eg *nel terzo paragrafo*).

Q8

This was quite a challenging question, as it is a grammar test as well as a comprehension exercise. It was answered well by good Higher candidates but proved quite difficult for the weaker ones, who simply resorted to guessing, especially in parts Q8(iv)-(vi),

Q9

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. However, weaker candidates were clearly simply guessing in parts. In Q9(a) most candidates managed to score at least one mark for *presenter* but many incorrectly translated *autrice* as *actress*. Q9(b) was mainly well answered, as the mark scheme also accepted *she has a passion for nature*, which was quite accessible, being a cognate. Q9(d) proved more demanding: many candidates were not familiar with *sensibili*, predictably translated incorrectly as *sensible* rather than *sensitive*, while others overlooked *normal/ordinary people*. In Q9(d) *social message* should have been fairly straightforward, being another cognate, but a few candidates omitted *social*. In Q9(e) the idea of vegetarianism was not always conveyed, while in Q9(f) some misunderstood the tenses and answered that no, it is not healthy to eat only vegetables *because once he ended up in hospital*. Very few used the conditional to translate *sarei finito su un letto di ospedale* but the future tense was accepted by the mark scheme reflecting an English usage.

Generally speaking, however, the overall standard was extremely high, with many candidates scoring well over half marks in both Tiers.

Paper 4F – Writing

Q1

The majority of candidates answered this question well, with a variety of vocabulary and activities. Only a few candidates left some blanks while others lost marks in the second part if they used verbs which did not make sense on their own, such as *prendere* or *andare* not followed by a noun. Marks were also lost through inclusion of non-Italian items of vocabulary or words which were spelled too incorrectly to be recognisable by a sympathetic native speaker.

Q2

Again, the majority of candidates responded fully to this question, at least in terms of communication, as most sentences were generally completed. This question proved quite demanding in terms of grammar but on the whole it was done better than last year, with many candidates managing to produce the third person of the verb at least in some sentences. However many still responded using the first person singular. Most displayed a good knowledge of lexis, producing appropriate vocabulary with accurate spelling. The picture of the sea led to some confusion with some candidates writing *spiaggia* or *montagna* instead, these answers were however accepted by the mark scheme.

Q3

This question was completed well with little omission or ambiguity. Any omissions generally occurred when candidates had to write about school start and finish times, as many were not familiar with *comincia* and *finisce*. On the other hand most were able to mention various school subjects and to express basic opinions about school. Therefore candidates generally scored high or even full marks for communication but accuracy was variable, although on the whole appropriate for the task.

Q4(a)

This was by far the more popular choice of the two questions, possibly because it enabled candidates to draw on well-established and familiar categories of vocabulary and structures, as it dealt with the well-rehearsed topic of holidays. 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.

Q4(b)

This question was clearly the less popular choice, but was also fairly well done by those who opted for it. Although at Foundation level it proved slightly more demanding than Q4(a), perhaps because it required a better ability to manipulate tenses and time indications in order to fulfil the tasks. Therefore many responses at this level were fairly short and simplistic.

Paper 4H – Writing

Q1(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 future tenses. 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) obviously was quite variable.

Q1(b)

This question was also chosen less at Higher level. Food and special occasions was clearly a less popular topic, however those who opted for this question performed well and tended to produce more concise responses, displaying again a good knowledge of various tenses and vocabulary relating to food and an ability to express likes and disliked, opinions and descriptions appropriate to the task.

Q2(a)

This was by far the more popular choice for the Higher task. The majority of candidates showed an ability to go beyond a minimal response to this question, expressing their views on public transport. Arguments for and against the various forms of transport ranged from the simplistic to the more detailed. A fair number of candidates showed that they were familiar with environmental vocabulary such as pollution, environment, exhaust fumes, improve, however *polluzione* was the most common mistake in terms of vocabulary.

Again, a variety of tenses was displayed, although more complex structures like the conditional, which were required by the last bullet point to suggest possible improvements to public transport, proved difficult for some.

The use of a variety of tenses, particularly the past tense, was often restricted by the candidates' interpretation of the title and the first and second bullet points (*problema* and *soluzione*). Many failed to see it in the simplest way, ie relate an incident/accident/problem that **occurred** (past tense in stimulus: *hai avuto problemi con i trasporti?*) whilst travelling and how they solved the problem, so they ended up talking about problems they have (present tense) with **public** transport (again, it didn't have to be public) and what can be done to solve this problem, or else expressing personal considerations on transport issues in their local area. Having said that, this alternative interpretation was accepted by the mark scheme, although at times it partly overlapped with the last bullet point.

This last point proved to be the most challenging, not just in terms of language structures required to provide advice but also in terms of content. Some candidates did not understand the question in the stimulus, as possibly they were not familiar with *mezzi pubblici* or else they struggled to understand the conditional *faresti*. Others lost marks by giving advice on environmental issues that were too general and not really related to public transport (such as reduce speed limits for cars).

Q2(b)

A less popular choice, again this year this was generally the choice of the native or near native speakers who were on the whole able to recount a story involving a mysterious envelope and unusual noises, using appropriate structures for a narrative piece (perfect, imperfect and pluperfect). The task left much scope to imagination, as candidates could tell any story they liked provided it arose from the stimulus. Unfortunately some candidates tended to either ignore or misinterpret the stimulus, as not everyone seemed to understand *busta*, while others incorrectly interpreted *rumore* as rumors, therefore some answers were partly irrelevant as they hardly contained any reference to an envelope or its possible content. On the other hand there were many instances of very imaginative and interesting responses.

General Comments on Paper 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.
- *Bene, buono* and *bello* are often confused and used incorrectly.
- Most candidates did not seem confident in the use of pronouns.
- *Mi piace/mi è piaciuto* is again 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 the absence of dictionaries.
- 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. 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 candidates' 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"). Even weaker candidates should be encouraged to produce varied responses instead of using the same material for more than one piece.

The range of language displayed in the coursework was again impressive. Many tasks had been specifically designed to include a range of tenses, complex structures, descriptions and opinions, for which many candidates were rewarded. On the other hand, candidates should be reminded not to be over-ambitious 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 entirely in the present tense, which did not allow them to display a range of tenses.

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 candidates has used the same stimulus material it is only necessary to include one copy.

Teachers are 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.

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. A few centres tended to be slightly more lenient when marking the controlled piece and slightly more severe when marking the uncontrolled pieces.

From an administrative point of view, centres need to ensure that all CF1 forms are correctly filled in, including topic titles and an indication of controlled/uncontrolled conditions, and that all candidates sign the CF1 cover sheet. Coursework drafts and final version should be clearly labelled and drafts should not be annotated to inform candidates of specific errors. 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 7th May deadline.

Statistical Information

GCSE Italian (1237) – June 2004

Grade Boundaries

Paper Number	Max Paper Mark								
		A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1F	50				38	31	24	17	10
1H	50	136	130	124	119	116	114		
2F	50				27	22	18	14	10
2H	150	140	134	128	123	117	114		
3F	50				33	28	23	18	13
3H	50	137	132	127	123	118	115		
4F	50				37	30	23	17	11
4H	150	134	130	126	123	117	114		
4C	60	51	45	39	33	27	21	15	9

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

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

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

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

Subject Number and Title		Paper Number and Title		% Contribution to Award	Mean Mark	Standard Deviation
1237	ITALIAN	1F	LISTENING FOUNDATION			
1237	ITALIAN	1H	LISTENING HIGHER		139.5	8.2
1237	ITALIAN	2FA	SPEAKING FOUNDATION A	25	33.1	5.4
1237	ITALIAN	2FB	SPEAKING FOUNDATION B		25.1	9.8
1237	ITALIAN	2HA	SPEAKING HIGHER A		142.0	6.0
1237	ITALIAN	2HB	SPEAKING HIGHER B		137.8	9.8
1237	ITALIAN	3F	READING FOUNDATION	25	35.0	8.0
1237	ITALIAN	3H	READING HIGHER		141.6	8.6
1237	ITALIAN	4C	COURSEWORK	25	40.0	10.9
1237	ITALIAN	4F	WRITING FOUNDATION		37.5	7.5
1237	ITALIAN	4H	WRITING HIGHER		136.7	7.6

Subject Number and Title	Number Sat	Pass %	Cumulative Percentages of Candidates at Specified Grades									
			A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U	
1237	ITALIAN	1996	99.9	49.4	64.9	77.3	89.1	94.0	96.7	99.0	99.9	100.0

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

Foundation Tier	
Raw Mark	UMS Score
50	59
49	59
48	59
47	59
46	59
45	59
44	58
43	56
42	55
41	54
40	53
39	51
38	50
37	49
36	47
35	46
34	44
33	43
32	41
31	40
30	39
29	37
28	36
27	34
26	33
25	31
24	30
23	29
22	27
21	26
20	24
19	23
18	21
17	20
16	19
15	17
14	16
13	14
12	13
11	11
10	10
9	9
8	8
7	7
6	6
5	5
4	4
3	3
2	2
1	1
0	0

Higher Tier	
Raw Mark	UMS Score
150	90
149	90
148	90
147	90
146	90
145	90
144	90
143	90
142	90
141	88
140	87
139	85
138	83
137	82
136	80
135	78
134	77
133	75
132	73
131	72
130	70
129	68
128	67
127	65
126	63
125	62
124	60
123	58
122	56
121	54
120	52
119	50
118	47
117	43
116	40
115	38
114	35
113	33
112	30
111	28
110	25
109	23
108	20
107	18
106	15
105	13
104	10
103	8
102	5
101	3
100	0

**Raw Mark to UMS Score Conversion Table
Paper 2 – Speaking**

Foundation Tier	
Raw Mark	UMS Score
50	59
49	59
48	59
47	59
46	59
45	59
44	59
43	59
42	59
41	59
40	59
39	59
38	59
37	59
36	59
35	59
34	59
33	59
32	59
31	57
30	55
29	54
28	52
27	50
26	48
25	46
24	44
23	42
22	40
21	38
20	35
19	33
18	30
17	28
16	25
15	23
14	20
13	18
12	15
11	13
10	10
9	9
8	8
7	7
6	6
5	5
4	4
3	3
2	2
1	1
0	0

Higher Tier	
Raw Mark	UMS Score
150	90
149	90
148	90
147	90
146	90
145	88
144	87
143	85
142	83
141	82
140	80
139	78
138	77
137	75
136	73
135	72
134	70
133	68
132	67
131	65
130	63
129	62
128	60
127	58
126	56
125	54
124	52
123	50
122	48
121	47
120	45
119	43
118	42
117	40
116	38
115	37
114	35
113	33
112	30
111	28
110	25
109	23
108	20
107	18
106	15
105	13
104	10
103	8
102	5
101	3
100	0

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

Foundation Tier	
Raw Mark	UMS Score
50	59
49	59
48	59
47	59
46	59
45	59
44	59
43	59
42	59
41	59
40	59
39	59
38	59
37	57
36	55
35	54
34	52
33	50
32	48
31	46
30	44
29	42
28	40
27	38
26	36
25	34
24	32
23	30
22	28
21	26
20	24
19	22
18	20
17	18
16	16
15	14
14	12
13	10
12	9
11	8
10	8
9	7
8	6
7	5
6	5
5	4
4	3
3	2
2	2
1	1
0	0

Higher Tier	
Raw Mark	UMS Score
150	90
149	90
148	90
147	90
146	90
145	90
144	90
143	90
142	90
141	88
140	86
139	84
138	82
137	80
136	78
135	76
134	74
133	72
132	70
131	68
130	66
129	64
128	62
127	60
126	58
125	55
124	53
123	50
122	48
121	46
120	44
119	42
118	40
117	38
116	37
115	35
114	33
113	30
112	28
111	26
110	23
109	21
108	19
107	16
106	14
105	12
104	9
103	7
102	5
101	2
100	0

**Raw Mark to UMS Score Conversion Table
Paper 4 – Writing**

Foundation Tier	
Raw Mark	UMS Score
50	59
49	59
48	59
47	59
46	59
45	59
44	59
43	58
42	56
41	55
40	54
39	53
38	51
37	50
36	49
35	47
34	46
33	44
32	43
31	41
30	40
29	39
28	37
27	36
26	34
25	33
24	31
23	30
22	28
21	27
20	25
19	23
18	22
17	20
16	18
15	17
14	15
13	13
12	12
11	10
10	9
9	8
8	7
7	6
6	5
5	5
4	4
3	3
2	2
1	1
0	0

Higher Tier	
Raw Mark	UMS Score
150	90
149	90
148	90
147	90
146	90
145	90
144	90
143	90
142	90
141	90
140	90
139	90
138	90
137	88
136	85
135	83
134	80
133	78
132	75
131	73
130	70
129	68
128	65
127	63
126	60
125	57
124	53
123	50
122	48
121	47
120	45
119	43
118	42
117	40
116	38
115	37
114	35
113	33
112	30
111	28
110	25
109	23
108	20
107	18
106	15
105	13
104	10
103	8
102	5
101	3
100	0

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

Raw Mark	UMS Score
60	90
59	90
58	90
57	90
56	88
55	87
54	85
53	83
52	82
51	80
50	78
49	77
48	75
47	73
46	72
45	70
44	68
43	67
42	65
41	63
40	62
39	60
38	58
37	57
36	55
35	53
34	52
33	50
32	48
31	47
30	45

Raw Mark	UMS Score
29	43
28	42
27	40
26	38
25	37
24	35
23	33
22	32
21	30
20	28
19	27
18	25
17	23
16	22
15	20
14	18
13	17
12	15
11	13
10	12
9	10
8	9
7	8
6	7
5	6
4	4
3	3
2	2
1	1
0	0

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

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Order Code UG015435 September 2004

For more information on Edexcel qualifications please contact our
Customer Response Centre on 0870 240 9800
or email: enquiries@edexcel.org.uk
or visit our website: www.edexcel.org.uk

London Qualifications Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: Stewart House, 32 Russell Square, London WC1B 5DN