

## MARK SCHEME FOR the June 2004 question papers

### 0502 First Language Spanish

**0502/1** Paper 1 (Reading and Directed Writing, Core), maximum raw mark 60

**0502/2** Paper 2 (Reading and Directed Writing, Extended), maximum raw mark 60

**0502/3** Paper 3 (Continuous Writing), maximum raw mark 40

These mark schemes are published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. They show the basis on which Examiners were initially instructed to award marks. They do not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began. Any substantial changes to the mark scheme that arose from these discussions will be recorded in the published *Report on the Examination*.

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

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the *Report on the Examination*.

- CIE will not enter into discussion or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the June 2004 question papers for most IGCSE and GCE Advanced (A) and Advanced Subsidiary (AS) Level syllabuses.



**Grade thresholds** taken for Syllabus 0502 (IGCSE First Language Spanish) in the June 2004 examination

	maximum mark available	minimum mark required for grade:			
		A	C	E	F
Component 1	60	N/A	39	28	18
Component 2	60	42	30	19	N/A
Component 3	40	32	26	19	15

The threshold (minimum mark) for B is set halfway between those for Grades A and C.

The threshold for D is set halfway between those for Grades C and E.

The threshold for G is set as many marks below the F threshold as the E threshold is above it.

Grade A\* does not exist at the level of an individual component.

**JUNE 2004**

**INTERNATIONAL GCSE**

**MARK SCHEME**

**MAXIMUM MARK: 60**

**SYLLABUS/COMPONENT: 0502/1**

**First Language Spanish  
(Reading and Directed Writing: Core)**



**UNIVERSITY of CAMBRIDGE**  
International Examinations

Page 1	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	FIRST LANGUAGE SPANISH IGCSE – JUNE 2004	0502	1

### General instructions for markers

- Tick at points in the script where you award marks.
- Put sub-totals for each part of a question in the margins and put the total for each question at the end of the answer.
- Transfer *total* mark for questions 1-10 to front of script.
- For questions 11 and 12, make brief comments at the end of the answer to explain why you have given your mark. This is very helpful if the script needs to be re-marked at a later stage. Comments may be also made on the body of the essay, if appropriate. Put marks for content and language at end of the answer, total them, and ring the total (e.g. 7 + 6 = 13). Transfer the totals to front of script.
- Total the marks for questions 1-10, 11, and 12 on the front of the script and ring the total. Double-check all addition. Your checker should re-check all the totals, but you remain responsible for their accuracy.

### Questions 1-10

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 1  | A  | 1 |
| 2  | C  | 1 |
| 3  | B  | 1 |
| 4  | B  | 1 |
| 5  | C  | 1 |
| 6  | D  | 1 |
| 7  | <i>Según el texto, ¿cómo intervinieron Ganesha y Shiva en la historia de los trasplantes?</i><br>Ganesha had an elephant's head transplanted on to him (1); Shiva performed the transplant (1).  | 2 |
| 8  | <i>Explique el trabajo de Murray en el avance del trasplante renal.</i><br>gained experience with skin transplants (1); learned how to deal with rejections of transplants (1); performed kidney transplants on dogs (1); performed transplant using organ from a twin (1)   | 4 |
| 9  | <i>¿Por qué razones cree el autor del texto que el uso de los trasplantes ha aumentado en la actualidad?</i><br>much more known about rejection and how to avert it (1), so more successes (1), not just with kidneys but with other organs (1).   | 3 |
| 10 | <i>Según el texto, ¿qué problemas y qué posibilidades se plantean hoy en día en el campo de los trasplantes de órganos?</i><br>growing demand (1); shortage of organs (1); xenotransplants may make up for this (1), using ideally primates (1) but possibly other animals (1), especially genetically modified pigs [do not accept just 'pigs'] (1); possibility of developing artificial organs (1). | 5 |

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>FIRST LANGUAGE SPANISH IGCSE – JUNE 2004</b>	<b>0502</b>	<b>1</b>

## Question 11

*Basándose en el texto, describa sus impresiones sobre el personaje llamado Daniel ‘el Mochuelo’.  
Escriba unas 150 palabras en total.*

**10 marks for description, 5 marks for expression and organisation,  
5 marks for language and style**

**Up to 10 marks for accurate description of character, based on close reading of text:**

- 1** a follower, not a leader (Roque has the ideas) (1)
- 2** takes a keen interest in the people of his community (1)
- 3** though so young, has capacity to form a judgment based on available evidence (Gerardo has done OK despite lack of 14 years' education and what his mother said of him)(1)
- 4** admires boldness in others (1)
- 5** feels attraction of 'forbidden fruit' (because it is forbidden, not because it is fruit!) (1)
- 6** is more timid than his friends (1)
- 7** but has his pride and so feels bound to go where they go (1)
- 8** has an active (1) but supple (1) conscience
- 9** is introspective (wonders why he is afraid when there is no objective reason for it) (1)
- 10** tries to rationalise and so calm his fear (1), showing intelligence and reasoning powers (1)

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	FIRST LANGUAGE SPANISH IGCSE – JUNE 2004	0502	1

**Up to 5 marks for expression and organisation viz.:**

5	Impressive ability to draw inferences from the text. Candidate's description of the character is well reasoned, insightful, soundly based on a close reading of the text, and supported by detailed evidence; there are no conspicuous omissions; text has been thoroughly understood.
4	Clearly able to draw inferences. Candidate's description shows some insight; it is clearly expressed and convincing, with some good support, though there are omissions; sound understanding of text.
3	Some evidence of capacity to draw inferences. Candidate's description is adequately expressed, with some generalised support from the text, but little detail; text appears to have been broadly understood.
2	Cannot progress beyond the obvious. Some confusion in expression; unwarranted inferences, and/or vague statements with little support from the text; some understanding comes over.
1	Confused; attempt at a description, but it is clear that the candidate has not really understood the text.
0	No clear description, no understanding of text.

**Up to 5 marks for language and style:**

5	Clear, sophisticated, language, appropriate to a piece of 'literary criticism' (but need not include any technical vocabulary); easy to follow, well organised; quotations or references are elegantly and appropriately integrated; reader's interest fully sustained; no formal errors.
4	Appropriate, varied language; can be followed without much effort; may be a little clumsiness in introducing quotations from/references to text; reader's interest sustained; formal errors minor (e.g. non-grammatical accent errors).
3	Language unambitious but not ambiguous; textual references may be clumsy or over-long; not always easy to follow; a number of errors.
2	Some ambiguity and confusion in language. Simple syntax, limited vocabulary; may quote at excessive length; rather an effort to read; many errors.
1	Very limited language. Whole-scale copying from text. Confused, maybe incomprehensible in places; many errors.
0	No rewardable language.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	FIRST LANGUAGE SPANISH IGCSE – JUNE 2004	0502	1

## Question 12

*Suponga que en el momento en que se interrumpe el relato hace su aparición Gerardo, el Indiano y les pide una explicación. Proponga una continuación para la historia. Escriba unas 250 palabras en total.*

**10 marks for content, 10 for language and style**

### Content

<b>9-10</b>	A lively and detailed account of Gerardo's appearance and its consequences, reading like a genuine sequel to the original passage. The characters' reactions are appropriate to what we learn about them from the printed passage. Convincing dialogue. Daniel's viewpoint is sustained and his character continues to emerge from what he reports. Enjoyable to read: reader is amused and intrigued.
<b>7-8</b>	A convincing account of events, which follows fairly naturally from the original passage. Characters' reactions are more or less what we should expect after reading the printed passage. An attempt to give Daniel's viewpoint. Appropriate use of dialogue. Reader is interested but not amused.
<b>5-6</b>	The account of events is generally acceptable, but does not follow seamlessly from the printed passage or draw out all its implications: may add details not warranted by original passage. Characters are recognisable. There is some attempt at dialogue. Daniel's viewpoint not sustained throughout. Easy to follow, but not particularly lively.
<b>3-4</b>	Account easy to follow, but not convincing at all points. Some of the reactions do not seem to be in character. Does not follow naturally from the original or exploit many of the details given in the printed passage. Some of the characters' reactions are inappropriate. Daniel's viewpoint not sustained. Little or no dialogue, no humour.
<b>1-2</b>	Scrappy, limited answer, with much confusion as to detail; candidate is incapable of exploiting detail from text in order to construct a sequel. No attempt at characterisation or viewpoint; no dialogue. Much irrelevance.
<b>0</b>	Nothing to reward.

### Language and style

<b>9-10</b>	A convincing, amusing pastiche of the author's style. Account clearly organised, dialogue well set out. No formal errors. A pleasure to read.
<b>7-8</b>	A discernible effort to imitate the author's style, but not fully successful. Well organised on the whole. An attempt to set out dialogue correctly. Formal errors minor.
<b>5-6</b>	No attempt to imitate the author's style, but the language used is unambiguous and with a little variety. Lacks humour and incisiveness. Some confusion. Errors in setting out dialogue. A number of formal errors.
<b>3-4</b>	Language unambitious, inappropriate; no sense of style; may be hard to follow at times. Confused presentation, many errors.
<b>1-2</b>	Poor, limited language; incomprehensible in places; many errors.
<b>0</b>	No rewardable language.

**JUNE 2004**

**INTERNATIONAL GCSE**

**MARK SCHEME**

**MAXIMUM MARK: 60**

**SYLLABUS/COMPONENT: 0502/2**

**First Language Spanish  
(Reading and Directed Writing: Extended)**





<b>Page 1</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>FIRST LANGUAGE SPANISH IGCSE – JUNE 2004</b>	<b>0502</b>	<b>2</b>

The more the script is annotated, the better.

- Technical errors should be indicated. There is no mathematical computation of such errors, but they should be taken into account when allotting a language mark.
- Examples of good language use and well-made points should be ticked and the ticks taken into account when considering the final mark for the essay.
- Comments at the end of the essay, explaining what the examiner considers to be the weak/strong points of the answer, will be very helpful if the script needs to be re-marked at any stage.

## **Part I, Question 1**

*Estos artículos describen enfoques muy diferentes del tratamiento de algunas enfermedades. Según la información de ambos artículos, ¿cuáles son las ventajas e inconvenientes de ambos métodos? Justifique su respuesta utilizando sus propias palabras.*

**15 marks for handling of text, 5 marks for language and style**

### **Content (handling of text)**

20 key points in the texts are identified.

- **One** mark should be awarded for each point clearly made by the candidate, up to a maximum of 15.
- Where a candidate makes a point its number should be noted in the margin. If the point is repeated it should be bracketed thus: (14R).
- Points that are not in either text should be marked 'IR' (irrelevant).
- Points that are not clearly made should be marked PNM and not credited.
- Where lifting takes place, give points for Content but bear in mind when awarding the Language mark

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>FIRST LANGUAGE SPANISH IGCSE – JUNE 2004</b>	<b>0502</b>	<b>2</b>

**Key points:**

- 1 Organ transplants are the realisation of a long-cherished human ambition
- 2 They carry a risk of rejection
- 3 There is a risk to the patient
- 4 They do lengthen lives/proven to work
- 5 Sophisticated modern techniques are required to prevent this
- 6 Constant research is taking place
- 7 Many vital organs can now be transplanted
- 8 Organ transplants are likely to increase in importance in the future
- 9 There is a shortage of donors
- 10 It may be possible to overcome this by using xenotransplants from primates,
- 11 genetically modified pigs,
- 12 or artificial organs.
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16 Homeopathy is 'natural'
- 17 It stimulates the body's natural defences
- 18 It is tailored to the individual rather than to the disease
- 19 It treats the whole person
- 20 Its principle is that like cures like
- 21 There is no proof that it works
- 22 It uses such infinitesimal doses that many people doubt that it can work at all
- 23 Its successes can be attributed to the placebo effect
- 24 But this argument is countered by the fact that it is said to work on children and animals
- 25 Other therapies also produce a placebo effect, but this doesn't mean they are useless
- 26 Homeopathic medicines have no side effects
- 27 Homeopathic medicines do not create addiction
- 28 Use of homeopathic medicines means that antibiotics can be left for more serious illnesses
- 29 They can be safely combined with other medicines
- 30
- 31
- 32

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>FIRST LANGUAGE SPANISH IGCSE – JUNE 2004</b>	<b>0502</b>	<b>2</b>

The 5 additional marks should be allotted as follows:

***Language and style***

<b>5 (Excellent)</b>	Pros and cons are clearly and fairly set forth. Arguments are clearly drawn from the text and not from the candidate's own ideas and prejudices. Clear, elegant language with complex syntax where appropriate. Good organisation, good linkage. Varied, precise vocabulary. Avoids irrelevance. No technical errors.
<b>4 (Good)</b>	Argument identifies pros and cons. Well rooted in the text; little intrusion of candidate's own ideas. Clear, appropriate language. Generally good organisation and good linkage; it is easy to follow the thread. Appropriate vocabulary. Little irrelevance. Technical errors very slight.
<b>3 (Adequate)</b>	Pros and cons sometimes, but not always, clearly identified. Use of text is apparent, but candidate's own ideas intrude in places. Language generally appropriate, but unsophisticated and generally simple syntax. Attempts to link, but not always connected; reader has to concentrate at times in order to follow thread. Adequate vocabulary. Relatively few technical errors.
<b>2 (Weak)</b>	Text not well handled; pros and cons not clear; candidate's own ideas very intrusive, with some confusion apparent. Unsophisticated language, not always appropriate. Very simple syntax with some clumsiness. Thread not easy to follow. Meaning may be obscure in places. Thin vocabulary. A number of technical errors.
<b>1 (Poor)</b>	Little use of text. No attempt to set out pros and cons. Thin, inappropriate use of language. Confused and obscure. Many errors.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	FIRST LANGUAGE SPANISH IGCSE – JUNE 2004	0502	2

## Part 1 – Question 2: televised debate

Utilizando la información provista en los dos artículos, escriba un debate televisivo entre la Doctora Marta Vicente, Directora de Investigación de la Organización Nacional de Trasplantes de Órganos y el Sr. Ricardo Méndez de la Sociedad Protectora de Animales. El tema a debatir es:

***¿Tenemos el derecho a experimentar con animales para obtener avances en la medicina, o existen alternativas?***

**15 marks for content, 5 for written expression**

### **Content**

Both texts present their subjects impartially; the first, in particular, rigidly eschews all moral judgements. It is therefore up to the candidate to use the information given in both texts in order to *underpin* the moral arguments which both participants in the debate are likely to adduce.

For a top mark there must be clear reference to **both** texts. This is important because weaker candidates are likely to virtually ignore the second text.

In good answers, therefore, we are looking for points like:

- 1 Does the shortage of human donors entitle us to use animals?
- 2 Do animals have rights?
- 3 Is it acceptable to genetically modify animals for our benefit?
- 4 On the other hand, should we assume that human needs should always be put before animal welfare?
- 5 Shouldn't we be grateful for such brilliant medical advances, which promise to cure diseases which formerly would have killed us?
- 6 Haven't we achieved what generations of our forebears could only dream of, and if we have, surely the sacrifice of a few animals doesn't matter much?
- 7 Why can't we concentrate on using gentler therapies to cure people, rather than going all out for high-tech?
- 8 Do transplants involve treating human (as well as animal!) bodies like pieces of meat, to be chopped up and 'served' to the patient?
- 9 Isn't it better to take the homeopathic view that body, mind and spirit are a unit and should always be treated, and respected, as such?
- 10 Doesn't the success (?) of homeopathy suggest that the best cures are when we work *with* nature, rather than against it?

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	FIRST LANGUAGE SPANISH IGCSE – JUNE 2004	0502	2

<b>Band 1: 13-15</b>	<p><b>A lively and convincing debate, drawing on both texts to create appropriate opinions for both participants; candidate's own opinions not at all intrusive.</b></p> <p>A large number of specific details from the texts are adduced. The candidate skilfully uses the impartial accounts given in both texts to create and support moral arguments for both participants. The candidate's own opinions do not swamp the debate, which is lively, balanced and couched in appropriate language.</p>
<b>Band 2: 10-12</b>	<p><b>A genuine debate. Good use of texts – the first more than the second – to produce appropriate arguments for both participants. Candidate's own opinions not unduly intrusive.</b></p> <p>A number of specific details from text 1 are adduced, and there is some use of text 2. The candidate shows a sound understanding of both texts but does not always manipulate them to best advantage to support the participants' arguments. The candidate's own opinions may be apparent, but do not distort what is a generally fair and convincing debate.</p>
<b>Band 3: 7-9</b>	<p><b>An acceptable debate, drawing mainly on the first text; some omissions and/or distortions. Candidate's own opinions apparent.</b></p> <p>Some appropriate details from text 1 are used; text 2 is mentioned. Both texts appear to have been broadly understood. The candidate displays some capacity to construct moral arguments for the participants, but his/her own opinions tend to intrude and distort the debate.</p>
<b>Band 4: 4-6</b>	<p><b>Some attempt to construct a debate; text 1 is used, but the candidate's opinions intrude.</b></p> <p>Candidate virtually ignores text 2. The link between what is said in text 1 and what the candidate makes the participants say is not always apparent. Some misunderstanding of the texts is evident, and much of the material remains unused. There is an attempt to provide arguments for both participants, but the debate is heavily affected by the candidate's own opinions.</p>
<b>Band 5: 1-3</b>	<p><b>Limited answer</b></p> <p>Little use is made of either text. Candidate appears not to understand them, though there may be some lifting to bulk out the participants' statements. The 'debate' is unbalanced, with no attempt to give both sides a fair hearing; candidate concentrates on giving his/her own opinions.</p>

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>FIRST LANGUAGE SPANISH IGCSE – JUNE 2004</b>	<b>0502</b>	<b>2</b>

***Written expression***

<b>5</b>	Well constructed and fluently written. A real sense of argument and counter-argument between two individuals. The language used by each participant is appropriate, befitting highly educated experts; idiomatic, even colloquial, language, if used when the debate becomes heated (as it legitimately may do), does not obscure the points being made. Sounds like a transcript of a genuine, highly articulate debate: a lively and interesting read. No, or trifling, technical errors.
<b>4</b>	Reads well; well constructed on the whole. A genuine exchange of arguments. The language used by the participants is generally appropriate for 'experts' and points are conveyed clearly. May sound inappropriately colloquial in places, or alternatively a little stilted. It is almost always clear what point is being made. Reader's interest sustained.
<b>3</b>	Effort made to construct arguments. Some attempt to convey a sense of experts talking – not always successful. May sound rather wooden and artificial. Alternatively, may use excessively colloquial language and have participants resort to mutual insult rather than argument. However, points are conveyed and suitable vocabulary is used on the whole. Technical errors do not impede communication. Reader may have to concentrate and/or make allowances in order to follow the arguments.
<b>2</b>	Poorly constructed; no clear differentiation between participants. Some points are conveyed but there is no sense of a genuine debate. Vocabulary limited, repetitive, not always suitable, but communicates without ambiguity. Reader may lose thread of arguments.
<b>1</b>	Poor construction, disjointed; many errors; not always comprehensible.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	FIRST LANGUAGE SPANISH IGCSE – JUNE 2004	0502	2

### Part 2, Question 3: report on schools

*Lea la siguiente información sobre dos colegios diferentes y escriba un informe detallado utilizando sus propias palabras en el que compara lo que los colegios ofrecen y explique las razones por las que usted escogería uno de ellos. Escriba unas 200 palabras.*

**15 marks for content and 5 for language and style**

**Content marks are divided as follows: (a) 10 for comparison deduction and (b) 5 for quality of arguments in support of candidate's choice**

This is a straightforward task in which the candidate has to write *en primera persona*. The **content** of the answers will be judged on **(a)** the number of relevant comparisons drawn from the stimulus material and the deductions made by the candidate from this evidence (10 marks), and **(b)** the reasons given in support of the candidate's choice (5 marks).

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	FIRST LANGUAGE SPANISH IGCSE – JUNE 2004	0502	2

(a) The stimulus material suggests the following comparisons and deductions:

Area	Comparisons	Deductions
Foundation	both schools have been around for a fair bit of time	they are clearly not fly-by-night
Date	Castilla has more pupils but fewer teachers	suggests Mostenses has a better teacher/pupil ratio
Slogan	C. focuses on excellence for all	suggests high academic expectations; collectivity more important than individual
	M. focuses on personalised education and preparation for today's world, but does not promise excellence	focus on individual; practical and career-oriented rather than academic?
Curriculum	C. mentions pure science and M. technology	not much to choose between them, but continues the academic v. practical orientation
Sport	C. is more definite: team sport is compulsory. Everyone has to represent the school!!!	this suggests high standards and expectations but also a degree of chivvying which will not suit the non-sporting
	M. is less demanding and does mention individual as well as team sports	again fits in with collectivity/individual contrast
Languages	Both mention they offer languages	
Drama & music	C. makes a precise claim (one production a year); M. simply says drama and music are available	neither says whether the subject is compulsory.
Academic results	C. (consistent with general approach) says excellent, M. just 'good'	which could mean anything (no school is going to say its exam results are bad!). Neither cites any figures or criteria to test its claims (e.g. percentage passing public examinations)
Head's statements	C.: close academic supervision, organisation and discipline, frequent testing, competitive sports. M.: personal development, balanced lifestyle, students taught to organise own time, importance of staff-student relations	all in all: C. pushes, M. leads
Student comments	C.: had to work hard, gained self-confidence, ambitions realised through hard work, appeals to competitive types. M.: language focus, nice teachers, social life, high expectations	all in all: C. is for ambitious go-getters, M. is for all-rounders

Allow 1 content point for a general comparison along the lines of 'both schools offer a wide curriculum'.

Award: **1 mark** for each *comparison* between Castilla and Mostenses (tick in body of essay and put C in margin)

**1 mark** for each *deduction* (tick in body of essay and put D in margin),

up to a **maximum of 10 marks**.

Add C + D to give a mark out of 10



Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	FIRST LANGUAGE SPANISH IGCSE – JUNE 2004	0502	2

**(b) Quality of arguments in support of candidate's choice**

<b>5 marks</b>	The candidate gives a very clear idea of what s/he is looking for in a school. The candidate has made comprehensive and intelligent deductions from the stimulus material and makes excellent use of those deductions to justify his/her choice, which is obviously and completely appropriate.
<b>4 marks</b>	The candidate explains clearly what s/he is looking for. His/her deductions from the stimulus material are logical, and are used to justify his/her choice, but not all the evidence is considered. Nonetheless the choice is appropriate.
<b>3 marks</b>	The reader can deduce what the candidate is looking for, but the candidate has not made this completely clear in his/her essay. The candidate has a reasonable idea of what each school is like, but his/her deductions from the stimulus material are not consistent and/or not complete. Nonetheless s/he has made some attempt to use them to justify his/her choice.
<b>2 marks</b>	It is not quite clear what sort of school the candidate really wants. S/he has not fully assimilated the stimulus material and has not deduced the real nature of either school. There is some attempt to use deductions to justify a choice, but it is not convincing. Some irrelevance.
<b>1 mark</b>	The candidate has not explained what s/he is looking for. False deductions and omissions. Choice does not seem justified from the stimulus material. Much irrelevance.
<b>0 marks</b>	Nothing to reward.

**Total (a) and (b) to give a final content mark out of 15**

**Language and style**

<b>5</b>	Well planned, from the elegantly phrased introduction to the firm, clear conclusion. Good paragraphing. Formal 'essay' style consistently maintained, with frequent examples of complex syntax where appropriate, but the writing is also lively. Good linkage, varied and appropriate vocabulary. No technical errors. A pleasure to read.
<b>4</b>	Sound planning, with an introduction and conclusion. Sense of progression. Generally good paragraphing. Formal style, perhaps a little flat in places. Some examples of ambitious syntax. Appropriate vocabulary, with some variety. Technical errors very slight. Reader's interest sustained.
<b>3</b>	Some faults in organisation: ideas do not always follow smoothly. Attempt to provide an introduction or conclusion; one or both may be a bit perfunctory. Attempt to paragraph. Language generally formal, perhaps a little monotonous and with unambitious syntax. Reader can follow the essay easily enough, but is not particularly interested.
<b>2</b>	Poorly organised; ideas do not always follow logically. Faults in paragraphing. May begin or end abruptly. Generally simple syntax. Meaning is conveyed without ambiguity, but the essay sounds dull. Technical errors create an unfavourable impression. Rather an effort to read.
<b>1</b>	Muddled. No attempt at appropriate style. Meaning not always clear. Many errors.

**JUNE 2004**

**INTERNATIONAL GCSE**

**MARK SCHEME**

**MAXIMUM MARK: 40**

**SYLLABUS/COMPONENT: 0502/3**

**First Language Spanish  
(Continuous Writing)**



Page 1	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	FIRST LANGUAGE SPANISH IGCSE – JUNE 2004	0502	3

## 1 Criterios

### MATERIAL

Interesante  
 Detallado  
 Explicado  
 Con ejemplos  
 Apropiado  
 Maduro

### ESTRUCTURA

Párrafos  
 Estructura global/coherencia  
 Comienzo y final  
 Efectos estructurales

### ESTILO

Variedad de vocabulario  
 Estructura de las oraciones  
 Lenguaje sofisticado  
 Sentido de estilo en situaciones diferentes

### PRECISIÓN

Gramática  
 Ortografía  
 Lenguaje  
 Uso de palabras

## 2 Técnica

Indique los errores principales en la primera mitad del ensayo.

Lea el ensayo juzgando la calidad del mismo en general y comprobando que es consistente.

Haga un balance de los puntos fuertes y débiles de acuerdo a los cuatro criterios.

Decida el nivel y ponga la nota.

## 3 Notas

No penalice el exceso de palabras. Los candidatos que escriben mucho o poco muestran, por lo general, puntos débiles dentro de los criterios establecidos.

Tenga en cuenta el uso de palabras o expresiones de zonas como Sudamérica, las cuales no deben ser consideradas como errores.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>FIRST LANGUAGE SPANISH IGCSE – JUNE 2004</b>	<b>0502</b>	<b>3</b>

#### **4 Descripciones de los niveles**

- 6-10** Comprensible en partes. Simple y con errores de lenguaje. Estructuras simples. Posiblemente sin párrafos. Evidencia clara de los candidatos con español como segunda lengua. El nivel más bajo de un logro positivo.
- 11-15** Debe ser comprensible a lo largo de todo el ensayo. Material muy sencillo, por ejemplo: narración sencilla, lista de hechos, sin adornos literarios. Muchos errores, lenguaje sencillo, a menudo con faltas. Estilo básico. Algunos párrafos. Consigue nota alta cuando se aprecia un sentido de logro.
- 16-19** Estos ensayos son dignos de consideración, pero el lenguaje y las ideas son todavía muy simples. Sin embargo hay mayor sentido de estructura que en el Nivel 11-15 y se empieza a escribir de una manera más detallada. Se justifican más. Muchos candidatos con español como segunda lengua se encuadran en este nivel; muchos errores pero, por lo general sin ser demasiado importantes. El material es todavía sencillo. Ganan nota alta los ensayos con virtudes positivas, pero, en general, no consiguen llegar a la meta que se han propuesto.
- 20-24** Estos son ensayos con muchas cualidades pero que, sin embargo, no tienen lo que hace falta para conseguir una nota más alta. A menudo muestran interés y madurez en el tema tratado así como intentan ofrecer detalles y explicaciones, aunque el efecto final sea incompleto. Quizás también, la calidad de alguna parte del ensayo no sea consistente. Generalmente bien estructurado, pero hay demasiados errores pequeños (más en la parte baja del nivel) y el vocabulario no es tan variado como se debiera esperar. Trate las notas 23-24 como un trabajo satisfactorio teniendo en cuenta el examen en conjunto.
- 25-29** El ensayo es de un nivel apropiado sin mostrar una sofisticada estructura. El material se desarrolla satisfactoriamente con una longitud apropiada; y, particularmente, en las notas 28-29 el vocabulario es muy competente. Los ensayos de tipo debate están bien estructurados y sin repeticiones. Espere claridad de expresión. La mayoría de los ensayos son bastante precisos aunque hay sitio para ensayos con más errores en las notas 25-26. Entren en este nivel ensayos con un alto nivel de competencia en todos los criterios salvo en el de precisión. Considere competencia a la edad de 16 años, no obras maestras.
- 30-34** Los candidatos escriben con un estilo más consciente, así que, espere giro de expresiones, vocabulario competente, buena selección de ideas; y en historias, secciones descriptivas y reflexivas, y capacidad para entender que la narración por sí sola es insuficiente. Para notas entre 30 y 32, se espera una alta capacidad en el estilo de escritura que a la edad de 16 años puede contrarrestar errores pequeños, como por ejemplo: comas en vez de punto final al final de una oración bien estructurada. En las notas 33 y 34 se espera más calidad en la técnica de escritura acompañada de pocos errores. Puede que haya un estilo pesado e incómodo que haga que la lectura no sea del todo entretenida.
- 35-40** Agradable de leer, quizás por la originalidad del tema (especialmente ficción sofisticada, original, experiencia personal), o por un estilo fácil o estructura progresiva. Las introducciones y las conclusiones son bien premiadas. La unidad del ensayo es importante. Pocos o casi ningún error, pero se pueden dar 35-37 puntos a trabajos con errores comunes, como: alguna coma en vez de punto. Está preparado para dar 40 puntos cuando crea que se ha establecido una completa y entretenida comunicación. Un buen criterio es querer leer el ensayo otra vez.

