UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

GCE Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the November 2005 question paper

8682 FRENCH LANGUAGE (AS LEVEL)
9716 FRENCH (A LEVEL)

8682/03, 9716/03   **Paper 3 (Essay)**

Maximum raw mark 40

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were initially instructed to award marks. It does 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*.

The minimum marks in these components needed for various grades were previously published with these mark schemes, but are now instead included in the Report on the Examination for this session.

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the November 2005 question papers for most IGCSE and GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

Language (out of 24)	**Content** (out of 16)
21-24 Very good Confident use of complex sentence patterns, generally accurate, extensive vocabulary, good sense of idiom.	**14-16 Very good** Detailed, clearly relevant and well illustrated; coherently argued and structured.
16-20 Good Generally sound grasp of grammar in spite of quite a few lapses; reads reasonably; some attempt at varied vocabulary.	**11-13 Good** Sound knowledge and generally relevant; some ability to develop argument and draw conclusions.
10-15 Adequate A tendency to be simple, clumsy or laboured; some degree of accuracy; inappropriate use of idiom.	**7-10 Adequate** Some knowledge, but not always relevant; a more limited capacity to argue.
5-9 Poor Consistently simple or pedestrian sentence patterns with persistent errors; limited vocabulary.	**3-6 Poor** Some attempt at argument, tends to be sketchy or unspecific; little attempt to structure an argument; major misunderstanding of question.
1-4 Very poor Only the simplest sentence patterns, little evidence of grammatical awareness, very limited vocabulary.	**1-2 Very poor** Vague and general, ideas presented at random.

1. QUALITY OF LANGUAGE

ACCURACY

Accurate use of grammatical constructions, ending, spelling, genders etc.

Very Good	Consistently accurate. More errors towards lower end of range, but of minor significance. Correct productive use of all GCSE grammar and, in addition, accurate use of more complex structures (verb forms, tenses, prepositions, word-order).
Good	Higher incidence of error than above, but clearly has a sound grasp of the grammatical elements in spite of lapses. Correct productive use of all GCSE grammar, and some capacity to use accurately more complex structures.
Adequate	Fair level of accuracy. Common tenses and regular verbs mostly correctly formed. Basic verb constructions mastered, but not always clear that GCSE grammar can be used productively. Difficulty with irregular verbs, use of prepositions.
Poor	Persistent errors in tense and verb forms; prepositions frequently incorrect. Evident that there are considerable limitations to the productive use of GCSE grammar, and no ability to go beyond that threshold.
Very Poor	Little or no evidence of grammatical awareness. Most constructions incomplete or incorrect. Consistent and repeated errors in gender, spelling, verb form etc. No ability for productive use of GCSE grammar. Most sentences contain at least one basic mistake.

FLUENCY

Quality and sophistication of syntax, sentence structure, but not its accuracy.

Very Good	Confident use of complex sentence patterns and linguistic structures and idiom. Uses language articulately and fluently, with at least the beginnings of a sense of style.
Good	Quite ambitious in use of complex sentence pattern, though not always successful in choosing the appropriate pattern to maintain style. Genuine effort to rise to the demands of fluent expression. Has not quite the flair and confidence of the best candidates, but essay reads easily.
Adequate	Expression rather forced, a little clumsy, perhaps somewhat anglicised but with some attempt at variety. Writing is coherent and sequential, but there is a limited range of sentence patterns with no real sense of style; the general impression that it is worthy but rather laboured.
Poor	Almost all sentence patterns are simple, with little use of subordinate clauses. Considerable degree of anglicism. Expression very forced and pedestrian.
Very Poor	Only able to produce the simplest sentence patterns. No subordinate clauses. Lack of coherent and fluent expression in the language. Many examples of anglicism/translatese.

RANGE

Credit for range of vocabulary and idiom etc. but penalty for ill-fitting accumulations of essay phrases.

Very Good	Extensive vocabulary, appropriately used. Very good sense of idiom. Some use of pre-learned expressions, but well integrated into the whole.
Good	Varied and interesting vocabulary, nearly always appropriately used. Some evidence of appreciation of idiom, and some ability to integrate pre-learned items of idiom into the whole.
Adequate	Some variation in choice of vocabulary, ability to use synonyms etc. Some use of less common words but not always appropriate or correct use. No real appreciation of idiom, and a high level of use of pre-learned items not fully digested.
Poor	Frequent repetition of common words. Little variety of vocabulary and no sense of idiomatic use. Occasional anglicisms.
Very Poor	Very limited vocabulary. Frequent anglicisms and incorrect use of vocabulary. Pre-learned idioms not integrated into the remaining linguistic content.

2. CONTENT

INFORMATION/FOCUS/RELEVANCE

Quality of material, ability to make clear and relevant response to the question.

Very Good	Detailed answer, showing extensive knowledge of the subject and a real understanding of the issues raised. Clearly relevant to the question, and supported by specific examples and references.
Good	Good points made, showing a sound knowledge of the subject and some understanding of the issues. Generally maintains relevance to the title, and supports the factual statements with a good range of examples and references.
Adequate	Covers the basic factual content adequately, with a reasonable range of examples. Despite the knowledge displayed, the material presented is not always relevant to the question asked, and the relationship of information presented to essay theme is not always clear.
Poor	Only limited knowledge of factual content, presented via generalisations with little specific reference. Makes some relevant points, but there are major omissions in the treatment of the subject, and a tendency to pad.
Very Poor	Only generalised statements of a vague kind, with limited reference to the title set, or even no real attempt to answer the actual question. Very sketchy.

ORGANISATION/STRUCTURE/ARGUMENT

Ability to use paragraphs, introduce and develop ideas, and to draw conclusions.

Very Good	Well-planned and structured essay with a clear introduction to the theme, a coherent argument and the ability to evaluate material and draw conclusions.
Good	Competent structure to the essay, with logical progression of ideas in paragraphs. Some ability to develop an argument and draw conclusions.
Adequate	Ideas generally quite well structured and a limited ability to organise into paragraphs and develop the argument. Limited capacity to draw conclusions from the material presented.
Poor	Little attempt to structure the work. There may be some sequence in the ideas and facts presented, but in general a weakness in paragraphing and no real build up of an argument to a conclusion.
Very Poor	Ideas presented at random. Sequence illogical, with no introduction, no development of an argument and no ability to draw conclusions.