

GCE

This Examiners' report relates to mark scheme

Publication code: UA015399

Examiners' Report

**GCE
Italian (8330/9330)**

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 UA015399

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

Contents

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 1. | Unit 1 Examiners' Report | 1 |
| 2. | Unit 2 Examiners' Report | 4 |
| 3. | Unit 3 Examiners' Report | 8 |
| 4. | Unit 4.1 Examiners' Report | 11 |
| 5. | Unit 5.1 Examiners' Report | 14 |
| 6. | Unit 5.2 Examiners' Report | 19 |
| 7. | Unit 6a Examiners' Report | 23 |
| 8. | Unit 6b Examiners' Report | 25 |
| 9. | Unit 6c Examiners' Report | 28 |
| 10. | Grade Awards and UMS in Modular AS/A2 Modern Languages | 31 |
| 11. | Making Entries for AS/A2 in Modern Languages | 34 |

AS Unit 1 (6561) – Listening and Writing

Candidates are required to listen to authentic recorded target-language material, to retrieve and convey information by responding to a range of mainly target-language questions and by producing a guided summary in English. They are also required to provide personal responses in the target language.

Assessment principles

Up to 26 marks are awarded positively for correct information retrieved and conveyed in response to target-language questions (Q1-4). The quality of language is only relevant in so far as it allows unambiguous communication.

Up to 4 marks are awarded for Content and 4 for Quality of Language for each of the two personal responses to Q5(a) and Q5(b) according to the relevant grids, for a maximum total of 16 marks. From this year knowledge and understanding of Italian society and culture is not specifically assessed in this paper.

Up to 8 marks are awarded positively for a guided summary in English showing the ability to understand the gist and details, infer ideas, select information, transfer it and communicate it concisely. No marks are awarded in this section for answers totally or partially in Italian.

Candidates' responses

Candidates showed understanding of the requirements of this unit and performed generally well. As intended, Q1-3 proved to be within reach of the bulk of the candidature, with most candidates scoring well over half of the marks available. Q4-6 produced a wider range of performance, allowing differentiation between candidates. Only a handful of candidates scored all the marks available, but high marks clearly outnumbered poor results.

In Q1, the passage was about a train derailment, the gist of which was generally understood. Candidates had to select 4 correct statements and most scored at least three of the four marks available. Some lost marks for ticking more than 4 answers.

Both Q2 and Q3 were based on a passage about *La Città del Gusto*, which was generally well understood.

Q2 was a gap filling exercise. The answers to Q2(a)-(c) were consistently correct. Candidates seemed familiar with this type of exercise although Q2(d)-(f), began to separate good candidates from weaker ones and identifying the correct word proved perhaps more difficult than understanding the passage itself.

Q3 was an exercise which involved pairing sentences and was generally answered well. Most candidates proved to have understood both the text and the technique to answer this kind of test. Candidates showed greater awareness of grammar in pairing, although a significant number of them paired (iv) with D, not realising that *persone* could not be linked to *insegnare* as a direct object.

Q4 involved answering target language questions. The passage was on road safety rules but the targeted information did not include any specific vocabulary.

Able candidates provided excellent responses. Weaker candidates showed difficulty in selecting and handling information, especially when some inference was required. Q4(a), (b) and (e) were answered correctly by the majority of candidates. For Q4(c) most candidates were able to retrieve the fact that young people were better than older people but failed to suggest why this was surprising. Q4(d) required candidates to recognise *sardi* as the people from *Sardegna*. Of those who did, only a minority proved they could spell it correctly. Any recognisable spelling was therefore accepted. In Q4(g) the word *opuscolo* was not very often recognised or transcribed correctly, in spite of being in the GCSE word list. In their answers to Q4(h) candidates very often neglected to mention the special nature of the phone or its purpose (or both).

Q5(a) and (b) were the personal response questions. There were a few very good answers for both questions, but answering within the word limit seems to remain the main problem. When candidates start their answers with irrelevant preambles, often lifted from the question, they end up exceeding the word count before making all their relevant points. Some candidates did massive crossing out of redundant sections, resulting in poor presentation.

For Q5(a), few candidates made good use of the information given in the text and turned it into a comprehensive personal response. Most candidates were only able to partially justify their answers, not being able to include all relevant facts for lack of conciseness.

Q5(b) is more demanding in that it cannot be answered by drawing from the text. Virtually all candidates referred to road safety regulations rather than rules in general, therefore full credit was given for Content in spite of *in generale* being ignored. Some interesting answers were produced by good candidates generally including both ideas of tougher sanctions and ways of increasing awareness. A number of candidates obviously knew about the introduction of '*patente a punti*', others offered it as a suggestion.

Q6 was the guided English summary, based on a passage on weather and its effects. This part of Unit 1 does not require any target language production but the abilities tested (understanding, inferring, selecting, transferring meaning and communicating concisely) make it a difficult task. There were still a few candidates who answered this question in Italian, therefore losing all available marks but word count was, once again, the main obstacle to gaining full credit. Although the last heading enabled anybody to produce creditable answers, these had often to be ignored for being beyond the word limit. Candidates should also check that what they write makes sense in English. Going for the nearest cognate is not always the best policy. *Interrupted*, for instance, does not make much sense when used to describe a road and does not represent an acceptable transfer of meaning for *strada interrotta*.

Advice and Guidance

Candidates appeared to be generally well trained in comprehending spoken texts and on the whole they showed more attention to the questions. Nevertheless, there were still a significant number of instances of targeted information correctly identified but used to (incorrectly) answer a different question. Identifying and selecting relevant information is perhaps an area in need of a little more attention. Candidates should also be made aware of questions requiring inference and trained to deal with them. The personal response questions require the ability to be concise and concentrate relevant information and opinion in a relatively small number of words. The majority of candidates are not trained to do this. Many indulge in preambles, often taken from the question, then continue to the upper limit of words, giving incomplete answers, or disregard the limit, making points that cannot be credited. A large number of candidates then proceed to deleting any redundancy producing untidy presentation and often unclear answers. Given the high proportion of marks awarded for this section of the paper, more training in providing concise, relevant answers will pay dividends. It may be superfluous to point out that candidates are not likely to score high marks for Quality of Language by simply transcribing sections lifted from the text. It is intended to be a personal response, after all.

More attention should also be devoted to the requirements of Q6 (guided English summary). Candidates often provide too detailed answers at the beginning thereby pushing relevant information beyond the accepted word count. Often the last section cannot be credited because of this. Also, as pointed out in the relevant section of the report, candidates should make sure that their English answers actually do convey the intended meaning, particularly those for whom English is not their first language.

| Maximum Mark | Unit 1 Grade Boundaries | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| | A | B | C | D | E |
| 50 | 38 | 33 | 28 | 23 | 19 |

AS Unit 2 (6562) – Reading and Writing

Examiner's Report

In this paper candidates are required to read authentic texts in Italian and to retrieve and convey information given in the texts by responding to a range of question types mainly in Italian. Candidates are also required to write 140-160 words in Italian based on a short printed stimulus and a list of 4 bullet points in the target language. The paper this year consisted of five texts of varying lengths. Reading tasks were set on the first four passages and in the final task candidates were required to write a reply to a letter in Italian.

Assessment Principles

Candidates were awarded marks for Q1-5 as shown in the mark scheme. Details that formed an essential part of an answer are underlined. Answers to Q6 were marked using the respective grids for Content (20 marks) and Quality of Language (20 marks). For this question it was no longer a requirement to demonstrate Knowledge and Understanding of Italy or an Italian-speaking community. Further changes that were implemented in this paper were in the marks awarded for Q4 and Q5, 10 and 12 respectively compared with 12 and 10 in papers previous to this. All these changes were outlined in the document issued in June 2003.

Candidates' Responses

The first three exercises are designed to be a 'gentle introduction' to this paper and they proved to be very accessible to a high percentage of the candidates with the more able achieving between 15 and the maximum of 18 marks. The less able also performed quite well. Those who performed badly in these tasks usually struggled to cope adequately with the remainder of the exam given that the level of difficulty increases in Q4 and Q5. Unless someone fails to answer Q6 then it is extremely unlikely that a candidate does not score some marks for both Content and Quality of Language. Having said this, Q6 certainly discriminates between those candidates who respond appropriately to the bullet points and are able to use a good variety of vocabulary and structures and those whose level of accuracy is such as to make much of what they write extremely difficult to comprehend.

Q1 Very well answered with a high percentage of candidates scoring full marks.

Q2 Candidates should now be familiar with the requirements of this exercise and fortunately very few resorted to copying out whole chunks of the text. It is always worth reminding candidates that only the exact words are acceptable eg Q2(a) *Sono anni* and Q2(e) *un sacco di* and any omissions or additions are not credited with the mark. A very high proportion of the candidates managed to score between 3 and 6, with the more able getting 5 or 6.

Q3 This question in the main was also very well answered with a good number of candidates scoring maximum marks. There were a few who did not understand the rubric and decided to put ticks in the boxes instead of the numbers of the relevant paragraphs. Had these candidates done past papers they would have already encountered this kind of exercise.

Q4 Most candidates now fully understand one of the essential requirements of this question, which is to try and answer the questions *con parole tue*. This does not mean that candidates are not allowed to use some of the words from the original text but they do need to manipulate the language of the original in some way. Although the questions were carefully devised to ensure that candidates could not just lift their answers verbatim there were still some who either chose to ignore the rubric or just couldn't be bothered to make the slightest alteration to the language of the original. To illustrate this point the candidates in question provided this answer to Q4(e) *viaggi, cene e regali mozzafiato* and duly scored 0 due to their lack of effort. It should not be beyond most candidates at this level to make a few simple changes and provide something on the lines of the answers in the mark scheme. They had to mention 2 advantages so if *mozzafiato* – a difficult word admittedly – caused a problem then they could focus their answer on *viaggi e cene*. A fairly common problem with this exercise is that many candidates understand the text and the questions but have great difficulty when it comes to expressing their answers eg the inability to transform the verb from the noun so that the answer to Q4(c) was *giochi con i figli* rather than *gioca con i figli*. Some candidates use the language very creatively: *pulizzare la casa, essere domesticativa*. In theory it should not be a problem to mark this exercise. In practice, it is extremely difficult at times, as candidates express the answer to the same question in a multiplicity of different ways. An examiner therefore has to decide if the content is not only acceptable but also expressed in a way that would be comprehensible to a sympathetic native speaker. Even if content is the key rather than accuracy there is a limit to which the sympathy element can be stretched.

Overall, the questions were well answered as far as content was concerned. The questions that caused most problems were Q4(f), (g) and (h). A frequent answer to Q4(g) was *non si sposerebbe* and a good number of candidates had trouble producing the correct pronoun *la* with *non gli/le/ci sposerebbe* featuring prominently. A fairly common response to Q4(h) was *vuole un uomo che sappia giocare con i figli* instead of *vuole un uomo perfetto/un marito ideale* (title of the extract) or something along these lines.

Q5 As reported last year the most distressing aspect in the answers to this question was the poor standard of English and particularly the spelling. Poor communication in English inevitably led to a loss of marks, as some answers were incomprehensible. One can have a lot of sympathy for foreign candidates but far less sympathy for native speakers of English. Here are some examples of poor spelling: *emergancy, speach, traning, viechles* (from someone who said in the written task she wanted to become a teacher of English). Other mistakes were the result of a complete misunderstanding of some of the Italian words and/or an inability to convey their meaning in English eg *agile transport; mezzo di trasporto* = half a transport; *una coppia* = a copy; *estate* = state; *cittadino* = little city; *prendere appunti* = to take appointments; *lingue* = language; *capacità di dialogo* = capacity of dialogue. The latter expression was a fairly common answer to Q5(j) and this clearly illustrates that some candidates cannot see beyond the literal translation of the words to produce something meaningful in English. It is not unreasonable to expect candidates to do this on occasions at this level and to produce an answer such as *an ability to communicate* should be within the bounds of possibility for most candidates. Regrettably this was not the case. The answer to Q5(i) was very straightforward but even here a good number of candidates wrote *language and sociology* instead of *languages and sociology*. One candidate even thought that *sociologia* meant 'psychology'.

A reasonable number of candidates thought that *going into the shops* etc was one of the key roles of the police in the answer to Q5(c) but the key roles related to their *availability* and *dealing with the problems of a particular area*. Many candidates got the second part but failed to grasp the meaning of *disponibilità*. For Q5(d) many candidates obviously failed to understand the significance of the tense in the original *è un lavoro in corso dall'estate* and produced answers such as: the experiment will start in the summer or the experiment was carried out in the summer. These answers were not acceptable. For Q5(e) it was fairly common for candidates to get one mark for *trial and error* but they failed to come up with an appropriate answer for the second mark. The main problem with Q5(e) was that candidates did not seem to know the word *evaluate* in English and came up with *to value/valuate/validate the results* or quite possibly they didn't know the Italian word *valutare*. As regards Q5(h), (i) and (j) the main problems that arose have already been mentioned but, all things considered, they were generally well answered.

Q6 Many candidates now seem to realise the importance of answering this question within the stipulated number of words. They write a balanced response, doing their best to deal with each bullet point appropriately and succinctly thus eliminating any irrelevancies. There are still those who insist on writing a minor thesis and consequently answer certain bullet points that are not assessed. Candidates who fail to respond to the bullet points within the word limit lose a lot of marks under Content although those who write well and fairly accurately usually score good marks under Quality of Language. It is still regrettable however when very good candidates lose marks as a result of a rubric infringement.

Despite the reference to *film doppiati* in the stimulus material and the first bullet point the main thrust of the remaining bullet points revolved around the importance of learning foreign languages and ways in which this could be encouraged. The topic therefore was highly relevant and a good number of candidates came up with very predictable but extremely valid points. A common failing amongst those who struggled to come up with something different for points 2 and 4 was to repeat in some way what they had written in response to the first bullet point. Repetition of the same idea could not be credited, as something new at least had to be incorporated into the answer. Where candidates did fall down is when they dwelt too long on the same point or they insisted on recounting their life's experience of language learning. Interesting as this may have been, it was usually irrelevant and ate substantially into the number of words available. As the written task was a response to a letter written on the Internet a correct letter format was not considered essential although many candidates did use an appropriate format and this should always be encouraged. The letter format is not included in the word count.

As far as Quality of Language is concerned the outcome was much as expected. There were some excellent candidates who displayed a good range of structures and vocabulary and made very few errors. The middle-of-the-road candidates tended to use a limited number of tenses and structures and relied a great deal on the modal verbs *potere* and *dovere*. There were too many candidates however who obviously did not know some of the basics of grammar such as: adjectival agreement; correct verb endings; correct use of the articles and the definite article in particular; possessive adjectives; the correct use of a gerund. At the bottom end of the spectrum a small number of candidates had no understanding of grammar whatsoever and could barely string two words together correctly. Here are some examples of common errors and others of creative language: *più bene; è difficile di; possebbono < potere?; qualche volte; invece di avendo; dopo aver leggendo; le persone chi guardano la tv; ho legguto tuo letto = ho letto la tua lettera* (one assumes); *e* for *è*; *paesi strani = paesi stranieri; grigio signore = egregio signore; tua lettura = la tua lettera*. Very few candidates knew some of the most commonly used verbs that are followed by a preposition + infinitive.

Advice and guidance

It is essential that candidates read the rubric for each question carefully and comply with all the necessary instructions. Failure to do so results in marks being needlessly lost. Candidates need to be reminded at frequent intervals of the various strategies that can be employed to guess the meaning of Italian words. In order to develop a good range of vocabulary candidates need to be exposed to a variety of texts and have ample practice in different exercise types to be able to deal competently with the first three questions. All candidates require a good deal of practice in manipulating the language of the original text to be able to cope adequately with Q4. For Q5 spelling and the inability to communicate answers in English will remain a problem if candidates do not spend sufficient time reading in their native language. It is not an easy task to find the most appropriate expression in your own language to convey the meaning of a phrase or expression in a foreign language. However, a good command of your own language can help considerably. It would at least be useful if teachers concentrated on parts of a text they are using in class and got their candidates to express the meaning of certain expressions in English. Training in time-management and reading techniques such as skimming and scanning should also form an integral part of exam preparation. Candidates should always be reminded of the fact that 50% of the marks for this Unit are allocated to the Writing Task (Q6). They would be well advised to devote an appropriate amount of their time to this activity and ensure that it is well planned so that all the bullet points are dealt with appropriately. All candidates need regular practice in the art of getting the essential parts of the message across in a concise way. In a writing task that imposes a maximum word limit of 160 words there is no room for irrelevant passages.

Candidates should try to write as legibly as possible, as it was noted by the examiners that the standard of handwriting had become much worse this year. In many papers, it was difficult to know whether the final letter of words was meant to be *a*, *o* or *e*. Equally a few candidates wrote their answers in pencil - candidates should be reminded to write their answers in blue or black ink.

| Maximum Mark | Unit 2 Grade Boundaries | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| | A | B | C | D | E |
| 80 | 54 | 47 | 41 | 35 | 29 |

Unit 3 (6563) - Prepared Oral Topic

Candidates are required to prepare a topic dealing with an aspect of culture and/or society of Italy or an Italian speaking community. They are expected to research their chosen topic and undertake extended reading from a variety of sources. They may freely choose the topic in consultation with their teacher but research and development should be personal. In advance of the examination they must complete the oral form with the topic title and 5-10 headings (in Italian): the form is used for reference during the test both by candidates and by the Examiner.

The Unit 3 oral test is devoted entirely to the prepared oral topic. Candidates must first present the topic for up to 2 minutes, then they must provide information and opinions on the topic in discussion with the examiner and thereby demonstrate Knowledge and Understanding of an aspect of contemporary society or cultural heritage of Italy or of an Italian speaking community. Examiners are expected to test candidates on their ability to engage in a conversation that goes beyond the target-language headings but remains within the chosen topic area.

Assessment Principles

This test is assessed positively using the revised grid: Quality of Language: 20 marks (10 for Accuracy and 10 for Range), Response: 20 marks, Knowledge and Understanding: 20 marks.

Candidates' Responses

As usual there were some excellent performances by candidates who had thoroughly prepared their chosen topic and were able to present a good range of pertinent facts, had the ability to analyse them in an interesting way and in so doing expressed their opinions. Irrespective of the level of the candidate, it is always pleasing to listen to an exam that has been well conducted and which allows the candidate the freedom to demonstrate his or her real ability. Unfortunately, there are still too many examples of pre-learned performances that have been over-rehearsed and consequently lack spontaneity - this goes totally against the spirit of the examination. Equally, some answers to the 'unpredictable' questions prove to be as carefully prepared (and indeed learned) as the rest of the examination.

Topics were generally wisely chosen, although there are still candidates who choose topics such as *la cucina italiana/la dieta mediterranea, una città/regione italiana* or an Italian celebrity, and can only produce a few facts, then struggle to produce anything of real substance during the rest of the oral. These topics are by no means to be avoided, but candidates have to realise that they are unlikely to score high marks under Knowledge and Understanding unless they can produce something that has more substance and gives them the opportunity for some in-depth analysis and expression of opinion. Fulsome recollections of visits to Italy or meals in Italian restaurants or a vague interest in football or fashion are not enough to produce the expected level of discussion.

Some candidates chose to base their discussions on comparison between the situation in Italy and UK with respect to a particular topic. In some cases the comparison was elicited by the teacher-examiner. In either case, anything more than a passing reference risks candidates producing irrelevant material.

Thankfully only a handful of candidates failed to relate the topic of their choice to the culture and/or society of Italy or an Italian speaking community. We try to be sympathetic to such candidates and, where possible, give them the benefit of the doubt. However, a discussion that makes not the slightest reference to Italy is given 0 for Content and therefore 0 for the other categories under which the exam is assessed. In some cases it would have been enough for the teacher-examiner to attempt to elicit some relevant point, which might have salvaged the exam. In one case, for instance, during the discussion on diets the candidate was asked if people in England were obsessed with dieting. The same question about people in Italy might have brought about enough relevance for the candidate to be able to score a reasonable mark at least for Quality of Language and Response.

It is also important for candidates to think of the structure of their two-minute presentation: some of them do not do it at all and are lead straight onto the discussion, others try to cram into it all that they have learnt.

Performances in terms of linguistic criteria did not differ from the previous exam series: the range was wide and well distributed, from very good performances - not infrequently above specification requirements - to moderate but still commendable extension of linguistic skills from GCSE. Control over agreements, gender and often over verb endings remains a problem even with otherwise able candidates and errors in word stress remain frequent. Words like *industria*, *stabili*, *comòdi*, *profùghi* remained a feature of many discussions, and, sadly, in some cases they were clearly handed down by the teacher. Range of appropriate lexis was often good or even very good, but structures were often limited and repetitive, with a large number of candidates not attempting any subordinate clauses. In the case of scripted material, structures were involved or even convoluted because they were too closely reliant on a written style gleaned from complex articles and not intended to be spoken.

Teacher-Examiners

Teacher-examiners are improving their conduct of exams, and some of them managed to elicit very interesting discussions. Some, on the other hand, only seemed to test for knowledge and did not offer any opportunity for the candidate to show understanding or the ability to respond, both within the prepared headings and outside them.

Often teacher-examiners failed to introduce unpredictable questions whereas others went off at too much of a tangent and completely ignored many of the bullet points listed by the candidate.

There were instances where the oral degenerated into a general conversation more on the lines of what you would expect at Higher Level GCSE.

Occasionally, teacher examiners still forgot that it was the candidates performance that was to be assessed and made a disproportionate use of the examining time. Sadly, the teacher-examiners involved do not seem to have taken any notice of the remarks made in previous years.

Administration

Some centres are still unaware of the 'new' oral forms (which were introduced last year and contain a section for the Edexcel examiner's comments).

The malpractice of using oral forms as prompts does not go unnoticed and credit is withheld for information which may have just been read. There were some instances where the candidate did either not put the title of the topic on the oral form or put the title but not the bullet points. This makes it difficult for the teacher-examiner to know how to develop the discussion and for the Edexcel examiner to determine whether any unpredictable questions have been asked and to award marks for the candidate's response to them.

Teacher-examiners should adhere to the required timing. Candidates are not likely to gain anything from a longer exam. If they are able they can demonstrate their ability in the time given. If they are not so able, they are more likely to show their weaker points as the exam goes on. Shorter exams are self-penalising because they do not offer opportunity to show the required amount of Knowledge and Understanding and the ability to sustain Response and Quality of Language.

Finally would all Centres please ensure that the recording equipment is in good order so that recordings can be made that are of good quality. It is extremely difficult, (nearly impossible in some cases) to try and assess the accuracy of the language used by the candidate when one has to struggle with grinding noise or loud hissing or when the candidate is barely audible. Sympathy for the candidate has to be balanced with fairness and it is not always fair to give the benefit of the doubt.

Advice and guidance

Advice and guidance can be derived from the comments made in the reports. In particular: Candidates should chose a topic of personal interest, making sure that:

- it is related to the culture and/or society of Italy or an Italian speaking community
- they have enough material to acquire all relevant knowledge
- it does not only involve factual knowledge but lends itself to analysis, evaluation and opinion
- it allows them to demonstrate their full potential

Candidates should plan and prepare their two-minute presentation carefully and be ready to discuss the topic thereafter.

Teacher-examiners should ensure that they do the following:

- elicit discussion and not test for knowledge only
- base the bulk of the exam on the subheadings (although not all of them have to be used)
- refrain from eliciting anecdotal material which gains little credit
- engage candidates in extensive comparison with UK situation
- make sure that the topic is unambiguously focused on Italian context, and steer the candidate towards it when he/she strays away
- ask a few unpredictable questions related to the chosen topic

For further advice and guidance please see end of Unit 4.1.

| Maximum Mark | Unit 3 Grade Boundaries | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| | A | B | C | D | E |
| 60 | 45 | 40 | 35 | 30 | 25 |

Unit 4.1 (6564/01) - Oral Discussion of Issues

Candidates are required to choose and prepare an issue on which they must adopt a stance. In advance of the examination they must complete the oral form with a brief statement, in Italian, of their issue and the stance adopted. As of the current examination series, the chosen issue no longer needs to relate to the culture and/or society of the target language countries or communities.

The test begins with the candidate outlining his/her issue and adopting a stance for about a minute. The examiner then challenges it and the candidate must defend it in discussion for 3-4 minutes.

For the remaining 9-10 minutes the examiner conducts a free-ranging conversation, **moving away from the chosen issue onto unpredictable areas.**

Candidates are expected to express and justify opinions, argue a case, discuss problems or current controversies etc. **as these arise naturally in spontaneous conversation.**

Assessment Principles

This test is assessed positively using the revised grids where marks are awarded as follows: Quality of Language: 20 marks (10 for Accuracy and 10 for Range), Response: 20 marks, Issue: 5 marks, Justification and Debate: 15 marks.

Candidates' Responses

As for Unit 3, there were some excellent performances and some very well conducted exams by teacher-examiners, who got the best out of the candidates and allowed them to perform freely and spontaneously. Most candidates seemed genuinely interested in their chosen issue and were motivated to discuss it intelligently. Similarly, most teacher-examiners were excellent in opposing the candidates' views and eliciting good debate.

There were a number of excellent performances from candidates (not necessarily native speakers) who were linguistically very able, coped admirably with unpredictable questions and displayed excellent debating skills. A small number of candidates were obviously out of their depth at this level. They lacked the necessary vocabulary and structures to discuss and debate issues.

The quality of language, as one would expect, was better than for Unit 3 performances but nevertheless the same comments apply to this unit as well.

Teacher-Examiners

Regrettably this Unit, more than Unit 3, seems to provide greater problems for a number of teacher-examiners who still seem unaware of how the exam should be conducted. This number is getting increasingly smaller, but still far too many candidates lose marks because of poor examining technique and lack of awareness of the requirements of this test.

An issue requires two sides: a clear stance taken by the candidate, with the teacher-examiner acting as a dissenter. A clearly defined stance enables the teacher-examiner to challenge it and the candidate to defend it.

The first issue is chosen by the candidate. On the oral form the title should be written in Italian and should clearly indicate the stance of the candidate.

La Mafia, l'Ecologia, la Moneta Unica Europea, for example, may well be issues but titles such as these do not tell the teacher-examiner anything about the candidate's stance and therefore there cannot be a proper debate. Indeed such poorly formulated titles are usually a clear indication that candidate and teacher-examiner alike are not aware of the exam rationale. "*L'introduzione dell'Euro e` stata un errore perché ha causato un innalzamento dei prezzi*" would be a clearly stated stance on an issue. The teacher-examiner can prepare his/her counter-argument and the candidate can demonstrate his/her ability to sustain the debate.

After the discussion of the first issue the subsequent issues should arise spontaneously. Teacher-examiners who encouraged a natural exchange of responses, enabled their candidates to score well on Response. Candidates who had been trained what to expect after the first issue and how to reply to a pre-determined set of questions were unfortunately disadvantaged and could only score a maximum of 8 out of 20 for Response. It is not in the intended spirit of the examination to allow their candidates to produce pre-learned material.

There were still a few cases of centres basing their exams on a permutation of combinations of the same issues, in turn as chosen or unpredictable ones, for or against. The same arguments and counter-arguments were produced and it is easy to understand how this may have affected the marks awarded for Justification and Debate.

More successful examiners introduced everyday topics, such as reality TV, parental authority, binge drinking or current issues such as ID cards, candidate loans and the treatment of prisoners in Iraq. These topics worked because they did not require such specialist vocabulary and it was therefore possible for candidates to express and justify their opinions spontaneously, without searching their memory for the right chunk of pre-learned material.

Often the chosen issue was discussed for an exceedingly long time, reducing the possibility of scoring for the ability to debate unpredictable issues.

Some teacher-examiners made the mistake of skipping from one issue to another too quickly (in some cases after only approximately 30 seconds), which does not give much time for any in-depth discussion. It is perfectly acceptable to move on if a candidate is really floundering and might handle another issue better, but a string of issues only just touched upon is not likely to show the candidate's ability of justification and debate.

Although for the second part of the examination the teacher-examiner is not required to take an opposing view from the candidate (but is free to do so), s/he should still elicit a debate from the candidate. Questions like "*Che cosa mi sai dire del consumo dell'alcool?*" or "*Parlami dei problemi dei giovani*" are often not sufficient to produce the required debate.

As for Unit 3, teacher-examiners are reminded to adhere to the time limit of the examination. Candidates are not likely to gain anything from a longer exam. If they are able they can demonstrate their ability in the time given. If they are not so able, they are more likely to show their weaker points as the exam goes on. Shorter exams are self-penalising because they do not offer opportunity to show the required amount of Justification and Debate and the ability to sustain Response and Quality of Language.

It must be emphasised once again that this list of examples of unsatisfactory conduct is not meant as a criticism of teacher-examiners. Most teacher-examiners conducted the examinations well and elicited a good performance from their candidates. The list was drawn up in the interest of future candidates. Increased awareness of possible shortcomings in the conduct of the exam can help teacher-examiners to improve their skills and candidates their performance.

Administration

Some centres are still unaware of the 'new' oral forms (which were introduced last year and contain a section for the Edexcel examiner's comments).

It is essential that Centres ensure that the recording equipment is in good order so that recordings can be made that are of good quality. It is extremely difficult, (nearly impossible in some cases) to try and assess the accuracy of the language used by the candidate when one has to struggle with grinding noise or loud hissing or when the candidate is barely audible. Sympathy for the candidate has to be balanced with fairness and it is not always fair to give the benefit of the doubt.

Advice and Guidance

Advice and guidance can be derived from the comments made in the report. In particular: The issue must be clearly stated and a stance taken.

Teacher's examiners should

- make sure that the issue is clearly stated and a stance is taken;
- prepare challenging counter-arguments so that a high level of justification and debate can be elicited;
- debate the chosen issue for the time required, but no longer;
- Introduce further issues, without undue concern about exposing their candidates to genuinely unpredictable questions. Well trained candidates cope with genuinely unpredictable questions extremely well and gain credit for it;
- exploit all the potential of subsequent issues before moving on to another one, but make sure that at least two further issues are introduced;
- refrain from being too confrontational keep the debate going;
- remember that eliciting knowledge or involving candidates in chatting about personal experiences is a waste of time and opportunity.

Candidates should be made aware of the following:

- There is a clear distinction between the Unit 3 **topic** and the unit 4/1 **issue**;
- It is very important to select an issue that is of genuine personal interest;
- the issue chosen for unit 4 does not need to be related to the culture and/or society of Italy or of an Italian speaking community;
- they must adopt a stance, clearly state it on their Module 4/1 and be ready to defend it;
- after approximately 4 minutes they will be engaged in a free-ranging discussion of further, unpredictable issues for the remaining 9-10 minutes.

In the interest of candidates, teacher-examiners are advised to scrupulously adhere to administrative procedures and to check the quality of recording.

| Maximum Mark | Unit 4.1 Grade Boundaries | | | | |
|--------------|---------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| | A | B | C | D | E |
| 60 | 44 | 39 | 34 | 30 | 26 |

A2 Unit 5.1 (6565/01) – Topics and Texts

Assessment Principles

All answers were marked according to the mark grids in the syllabus and each was read once for language and once for content. The mark grids make it clear that five essential aspects of the work are being evaluated:

- knowledge of the text and/or topic
- the ability to use and analyse that knowledge
- coherent and persuasive organisation of material
- logical sequencing and development of ideas
- accuracy and sophistication of written Italian

Candidates' Responses

Once again, the overall standard of responses on this paper was good, with a large number of candidates writing substantially over the minimum of 250 words. Most candidates proved to be comfortable answering in Italian, and many showed a thorough knowledge of the topics and texts and a firm grasp of the implications of the questions.

Candidates are reminded of the importance of indicating clearly on the front of their scripts which questions they have attempted. Moreover, they should check that the answer they write matches the question number – there were quite a few instances this year of candidates writing, say, Q7(b) but actually answering Q7(a).

Candidates were as keen as ever this year to quote from the texts they had studied. Although in some cases these were correctly transcribed and relevantly used, there were many examples of candidates misquoting. Quotation is not seen as a necessary element of a successful answer on this paper. Use of example to substantiate the points made is necessary and desirable, but this need not mean quoting from the text directly. Moreover, candidates are advised to be sure that the names (and spellings) of characters or places to which they want to refer in their answers have been learned reliably – there were more instances this year than ever before of candidates misspelling the names of characters or texts, which does not create the best impression!

Although word limit is only a guide, some candidates who exceeded it excessively tended to produce essays that 'went off the boil' by including irrelevant information that went beyond the parameters of the question. On the other hand, those that wrote too little obviously penalised themselves by not providing enough evidence of knowledge and understanding.

There were still a few candidates this year who produced an answer to the question they hoped would be set rather than the question that was actually set. Indeed, there were a certain number of answers that seemed to be based substantially on the questions set in last year's paper! Candidates are reminded that they should answer the question set as specifically as possible. No credit can be given for Knowledge and Understanding of the topic or text which is not relevant to the question set.

Candidates' ability to plan and structure their essays was increasingly evident this year. There were still some candidates, however, who had not planned their answers before writing them, with the result that the organisation of their essays was often illogical or rambling, and the development of ideas often patchy or unambitious.

Centres are reminded that scripts should be sent to examiners using the normal first class post, and should not be sent registered or recorded or using a courier company like DHL or FedEx.

As in previous years, relatively few candidates chose Q1. In response to Q1(a), most candidates agreed that the influence of the family was decreasing due to factors such as the rise in the number of working mothers, the move from the country to the cities, and the gradual move away from traditional values. Candidates thought that there was still an important role to be played by the family, but that its waning influence was evident in the number of young people involved in crime, drugs etc. In response to Q1(b), various aspects of the North/South divide were listed, both socio-economic and geographical. The rise of parties such as the *Lega Nord* was seen as a political consequence of this state of affairs, while social consequences that were listed included the rise in organised crime, emigration, immigration and unemployment. Few candidates were optimistic about the future, seeing this situation as something of a vicious circle.

Once again, there were few answers on the *Risorgimento* this year. Almost all of those who had studied this topic chose Q2(b). Among the expected benefits of unification most commonly listed were freedom from foreign domination, greater access to modern technology, voting rights, and a better quality of life with independence from the landowners. Most candidates felt that these advantages had not been realised, noting that while quality of life improved for a few, mostly in the North, on the whole lack of investment and an uneven commitment to universal suffrage meant that there was limited change for many.

The region once again proved a hugely popular topic, but as in previous years there was a broad range of ability and some very weak answers. Q3(a) proved slightly more popular than Q3(b). There were several excellent answers demonstrating a wealth of knowledge which was well manipulated to fit the question. However, many candidates either failed to address the positive/negative effects or ignored the section on the future of industry in their chosen region. Some candidates produced mainly descriptive/narrative answers. The regions most commonly studied were Sicily, Campania, Tuscany and Liguria. In response to Q3(b), many candidates produced a list of types of food which read more like a menu than an evaluative response! Some failed to explain the significance of this diet. Others misinterpreted the question and wrote about the breakdown of traditions in general, ranging from teenage pregnancy to drug abuse. The best essays explained fully the social/historical reasons for the development of this diet, identified ways in which it was under threat from modern trends, and gave a full justification for why they felt (or not) that the *dieta tradizionale* needed protecting.

The mafia continues to be a popular topic, although many candidates who study it seem to struggle to provide enough relevant detail or analysis in their answers to score very highly. In response to Q4(a), some candidates were able to explain the importance of the immediate post-war situation in the development of mafia links with politics. Better answers argued that both Mafiosi and politicians benefited from this relationship, although the former were considered to have risked considerably less than the latter. More able candidates argued that although there was obvious gain for the mafia in the four post-war decades, in recent times the government had benefited significantly from this 'relationship' by being able to gain an intimate knowledge of the structure and workings of the organisation from the *pentiti* who collaborated with them. On the whole, though, this question was rather poorly done, and a surprising number of answers seemed to show no knowledge of the relationship between mafia and politics.

Q4(b) was slightly more successfully tackled on the whole, although there were two – equally valid – interpretations of the question. Some candidates thought the *giovani* of the title were those from the strongholds of organised crime who were showing less interest in adopting that lifestyle. Others took the *giovani* to mean young Italians in general. Many candidates agreed that there was greater awareness of the phenomenon of organised crime in the wake of the *maxiprocessi* and the high profile murders of the 1990's, and that this had led to young people all over Italy, as well as just in the worst affected areas, taking initiatives to express their opposition. Better answers provided details of these movements or initiatives. The cultural change in the southern regions was seen as another relevant factor, with young people less inclined than before to observe codes of honour.

There were plenty of answers on the Fascist-era texts this year, and quite a range of ability. In response to Q5(a), candidates used different examples according to the texts studied, but many were able to show successfully how the presentation of the children affected the reader's response to the period described. More popular was Q5(b), where there was a wide range of episodes chosen. Better answers explained convincingly why the episode was particularly moving, while less successful essays restricted themselves to describing the events of the episode with only a token attempt to analyse.

Once again, Q6 produced some very good answers indeed, including many that were a pleasure to read. Q6(a) was by some distance the more popular of the questions, with many candidates able to demonstrate an impressive understanding of Pereira's relationship with Monteiro Rossi. The most commonly made points were that the childless Pereira acted as a father figure to the orphan Rossi, and that both were able to learn from this relationship. It was through Rossi, candidates felt, that Pereira was able to rediscover some of his lost youth and overcome the emotional and psychological crisis that was paralysing him. There was some excellent analysis of how the relationship was portrayed in the book and on the screen, with many candidates deciding that it was more important in the book, because the reader was given insights into Pereira's state of mind, and others making the case for the film, arguing that the film makes this relationship its focus while the book has several strands vying for the reader's attention. Q6(b) was attempted by very few candidates, but was well done on the whole. Candidates demonstrated an excellent understanding of the question and provided a thorough analysis of the narratorial style – the use of the *passato remoto*, repetition, journalistic approach etc. The best answers explored how the film tried to imitate this narrative style through the use of music etc and discussed the limitations of this genre. The majority of candidates reached the conclusion that book and film complement one another.

The Cardella text proved to be very popular once again this year, and once again it was this text that elicited some of the weakest (predominantly factual) answers. Q7(a) was by far the most popular choice. Unfortunately, many candidates limited themselves to recounting the events of the end of the story (or in some cases the whole story), without offering any convincing evaluation of whether this was an optimistic or pessimistic ending. However, there were some impressive answers to this question, which showed a firm grasp not only of the events of the story but also its key themes. Some candidates argued that it was an optimistic ending because a difficult time for Annetta comes to an end, she achieves independence from her parents, marries and has a family, because her uncle is brought to justice, or because the strong suggestion is that the future for girls like Annetta is brighter. Others argued that it was a pessimistic ending because Annetta is simply conforming to the expectations of the society in which she lives by marrying Nicola, taking on the predetermined role of wife and mother, surrendering her individuality to a different man etc. They also felt that her parents don't learn anything in the story. More able candidates argued that this ending is meant to be both optimistic and pessimistic, and that this moral ambiguity is a key part of Cardella's 'message'.

The few candidates who attempted Q7(b) agreed that the Church was a negative influence in the story, seeing it as responsible for the oppressive and misogynistic moral code that prevails, and pointing out that it does nothing to address the social problems (domestic violence, poverty, illiteracy etc) of the inhabitants. However, there were some answers here which were unable to convincingly identify specific ways in which the Church plays a role in the society depicted in the story.

There were virtually no responses on the Celati text this year.

There were rather fewer answers on Dante this year, almost all candidates choosing Q9(a). On the whole, they demonstrated a good general knowledge of the Canti studied, and offered a good description of Virgil's role, but many failed to give enough precise examples in order to analyse the relationship between Dante and Virgil and the way in which this relationship changes and develops over the course of the journey.

There were – disappointingly – no essays on the Fo text this year.

An ever-increasing number of candidates are choosing the Ginzburg text, and once again the standard of the answers was generally high. Q11(a) attracted relatively few takers, but most who did this question felt that the fragmentation of the story did obstruct its coherence to at least some extent initially, but that as we learn more about the different characters and historical contexts of the novel things fall into place neatly. More able candidates offered the idea that this fragmentation may be intended to mirror the lack of cohesion and togetherness in the society depicted. In response to Q11(b), there were some answers which overlooked the need to discuss specific social or personal factors which might be responsible for the breakdown or failure of the relationships of the characters, limiting themselves to discussing these relationships in general. The better answers, however, isolated social expectations, family pressures, village life, the past and the war as relevant social factors. Personal factors mentioned included the weakness of specific characters and their inability to communicate or follow personal goals. Most agreed that the way Ginzburg presents them, these relationships are doomed to failure.

The Moravia text continues to be popular, and attracted some impressive responses this year. The majority of candidates chose Q12(a), and the most commonly named influences were the governess, the nurse and Luca's mother. On the whole these answers showed a good knowledge of the text and a sound understanding of its key themes, with candidates able to assess the degree of influence of each character they discussed before justifying their choice. Q12(b) was slightly less well done, mostly because those who chose it seemed unsure of what a symbol was in the context of the novel. Some successful answers here looked at the picture of the Madonna, the use of trains and the idea of illness, concluding that the role of these symbols is to underline the key moments in Luca's development or to offer social criticism.

Once again, Pirandello proved hugely popular this year, and here too the standard was generally high. However, as every year there was a fair smattering of candidates who clearly found the central ideas of the play beyond them. Q13(a) was marginally the more popular of the two questions. The main elements of the character of the *Figliastro* that were mentioned were her youth, her self-confidence, her egocentricity, her lack of emotional stability, her unpredictability, her distaste for the *Padre*, and her determination to tell her story. Her function in the play was judged by candidates to be to balance the audience's view of the *Padre*, to help to draw the Actors into their story, to hold the Characters together and to represent them.

In response to Q13(b), the relationship between the Actors and the Characters was thought by candidates to be characterised by misunderstanding and conflict on various levels, enabling Pirandello to make a point about the lack of effective communication between individuals. The relationship was seen by more able candidates to be one of mutual dependence. Others saw it as a reflection of the conflict between fiction and reality, or as a device to underline Pirandello's point about the futility of words. Most candidates showed an impressive understanding of the key themes of the play in these essays, and the majority agreed that the Characters are more 'real', as their tragedy touches them more than anything in the Actors' lives and because their 'reality' is immutable.

| Maximum Mark | Unit 5.1 Grade Boundaries | | | | |
|--------------|---------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| | A | B | C | D | E |
| 90 | 60 | 54 | 48 | 42 | 36 |

A2 Unit 5.2 (6565/02) - Coursework

Assessment Principles

In the 2004 examination series many centres were not aware of the new grids for marking coursework and therefore used the old ones. Teachers should refer to the new assessment grids published in the latest edition of the Specification (Issue 4, published in October 2003) or in the Notice to Centres published in June 2003.

Coursework is positively assessed by teacher-examiners, and a sample from each centre is moderated by Edexcel. Marks are awarded by reference to the assessment grids (as mentioned above): 30 for Knowledge and Understanding, 9 for Organisation and Development, and 6 for Quality of Language. The maximum mark for each piece of work is 45. The mark for the second piece of Coursework (1000 words) is multiplied by two and added to the mark for the first piece (500 words) out of 45, to give a total mark out of 135.

In the 2004 examination series, marks awarded by teacher-examiners for Quality of Language were generally accurate, but there was once again a tendency on the part of most to award excessively generous marks for content, both on the Knowledge and Understanding and Organisation and Development grids. Teacher-examiners are once again reminded not to be too lenient with coursework where there is no depth of analysis and where there is no discernible evidence of a logical development of ideas or a coherent structure, particularly with the new grids which place even greater emphasis on Knowledge and Understanding.

Candidates' Responses

The candidates' work was generally of very good standard again, from the point of view of both language and content. Almost all candidates managed at least a reasonable level of linguistic accuracy and were therefore able to communicate their points clearly almost all the time. Their work was usually well presented, in a word processed format and often beautifully illustrated with photographs and tables.

Choice of topic

Once again the candidates' choice of topic (and subsequent choice of title) proved to be a major factor in the quality of their coursework, as only those topics (and titles) that were suitable for an analytical and evaluative approach tended to reach the higher brackets of the Knowledge and Understanding & Organisation and Development grids, even when the language was fluent, varied and appropriate.

Topics were quite varied: a lot of candidates chose to deal with a social or political aspect of modern Italy, such as the Mafia, immigration, Berlusconi, the protection of the environment, sport, the role of women, the changes in the Italian family, young people and their problems. A lot of candidates chose to submit coursework on Italian literature, with L.Cardella ("Volevo I pantaloni"), I.Calvino ("Marcovaldo"), L.Sciascia ("Il giorno della civetta") and P.Levi ("Se questo è un uomo") being among the most popular authors. Other candidates opted for history or art, focusing particularly on Mussolini and the Fascist era or the Renaissance, and for Italian cinema, concentrating especially on R.Benigni ("La vita è bella") or neorealism.

Candidates must be reminded, however, that they should choose topics related to Italian society and culture. There were a few instances of essays which focused on global issues with little or no reference to Italy.

As for the short piece (500 words), the majority of candidates sensibly chose to focus on a particular aspect of a topic, often inspired by topical news items relating to Italy, thus producing essays that were more limited and realistic in scope.

Once again the best pieces were generally the ones that were able to include an appropriate amount of analysis and evaluation, while those with a more general focus or a rather descriptive nature (eg pieces on an Italian region which is still a very popular, albeit rather unsuitable, coursework topic) tended to score less highly due to the absence of the analytical element.

The candidates' choice of title is another major factor in the success or otherwise of their coursework. Clearly focused titles tended to produce more analytical, better-organised and better-argued pieces compared to more general titles, which tended to lead to more factual or descriptive pieces. Some titles were well chosen so as to achieve some evaluative analysis ("Fino a che punto la donna italiana può conciliare la carriera con la famiglia?", "È giusto rimuovere il crocifisso dalle aule?", "In quale misura la TV influisce sulla società italiana?") but a lot of titles were still too generic and unfocused (such as "Il vino italiano", "La Ferrari", "Il turismo in Italia", "Il crac della Parmalat") and likely to produce merely narrative or descriptive pieces. Candidates should be encouraged to phrase their titles in the form of a question, which in most cases allows them to incorporate easily the analytical dimension required by this unit. Titles in the form of a question should however ask *Why?* or *To what extent?* rather than *What?*

There was also some concern among the moderators that in some cases the candidates had not chosen their own titles and had responded instead to prompts from their teachers. This was particularly obvious whenever candidates were unable to exploit the potential offered by a promising title, thus choosing to deal with the purely narrative or descriptive or failing to address clearly the issues raised by the title. This was also the case when more than one candidate in a centre addressed the same title. Teachers are reminded that although their advice is certainly of great value to candidates when choosing topics and titles, they should be wary of "imposing" on candidates titles or topics which have not been fully grasped by the candidates.

Length

There were very few problems in this area this year, although some of the long pieces (1000 words) were still over the word limit. Essays which are excessively short or long are self-penalising and candidates should be made aware of this. Moreover, there were still plenty of instances of candidates including only an approximate word count, or even no word count. They should be made aware of the importance of including an exact word count (not including quotations) with each piece of coursework.

Planning

Most candidates produced reasonably detailed and coherent plans to accompany their essays, but there were still a few examples of sketchy and brief plans which often seemed to have been added as an afterthought. The organisation of points and the logical sequencing of ideas are a fundamental part of coursework and candidates are reminded that a clear and careful plan can be a great help in this area.

Bibliographies

Most candidates' bibliographies contained an adequate variety of source material in the target language but some often contained too many items in English, thus defeating the purpose of encouraging research in the target language. Moreover, the moderators were concerned that on the long piece (1000 words) some candidates were relying on only a few newspaper articles or Internet sites for their research. Candidates are reminded that they are required to read the equivalent of one substantial book in the target language. Also, candidates are reminded that whenever the Internet is used as a resource the full website address must be included in the bibliography. The moderators noted instead that candidates often tended to put only a vague reference to an Internet site in their bibliography.

Advice and guidance

As a rule, teachers preparing candidates for this component were clearly familiar with the Coursework Guide, but in order to make absolutely sure that their candidates have the best chance of success, they should ensure that all candidates:

- have access to a suitable body of source materials;
- are encouraged to approach their topic from a personal angle and are equipped with the necessary skills to develop their own ideas and express them in their own words;
- choose topics firmly rooted in Italian culture / society;
- choose two topics that are clearly distinct;
- devise clearly focused titles which lend themselves to an analytical treatment of their topic;
- follow the guidelines (given in the Coursework Guide) on suitable and unsuitable topics;
- include a plan and bibliography for each piece of work - the bibliography should give full details of publications, dates, pages, etc.
- complete the candidate's checklist for each piece of work;
- understand that plagiarism and unattributed quotations constitute unacceptable practice.

Teachers are also urged to take note of the following administrative points:

1. Coursework should be submitted according to regulations: every year there are still a few instances of pieces submitted without the essential requirements, i.e. submitted without a plan, a bibliography, a word count, a Candidate's Record Sheet, sometimes not even marked by a teacher. Centres are reminded that if they do not have an Italian teacher available to mark the coursework, their candidates should be entered for Unit 5.1.
2. Correct completion of OPTEMS and Candidate Record Cards is of paramount importance. Marks on the Candidate Record Card should correspond to those on the OPTEMS.
3. Packaging should be of a type which permits easy handling and storage, as well as easy access to the candidate's work. The most convenient method is for the Candidate Card and the two pieces of coursework to be presented in a single transparent envelope or pocket file, without fixings other than possibly treasury tags. The two pieces should be accompanied by the Candidate's Record Sheet. Otherwise it can be difficult for the moderators to identify the correct coursework for each candidate. Each individual piece should also be labelled with the candidate's name and the centre's name or number, so as to be identifiable when it is returned to the centre."
4. Both pieces of coursework should be marked by the same teacher.
5. All sections of the Candidate Record Card should be completed, and it should be signed by both candidate and supervising teacher.

6. A bibliography of all materials referred to should be given at the end of each piece.
7. Teachers should ensure that their candidates have used the checklist to satisfy themselves that all coursework criteria have been met. The checklist should be included with each piece of coursework.
8. Coursework should be sent to the Moderator by the date specified using the normal postal service. Please do not send coursework through DHL, Parcelforce or similar companies.

NB. Wholesale copying from or adaptation of material from printed or other sources, the use of unattributed quotations, or other plagiaristic practices are serious offences which can result in candidates being disqualified from the examination. Teachers should explain to candidates the unacceptability of plagiarism and should give them clear warning of the serious consequences of such practice. It may be necessary to explain in simple terms that copying material is generally unproductive even if attributed and constitutes plagiarism if unattributed. It should also be noted that copied material is usually very obvious to the moderators.

| Maximum Mark | Unit 5.2 Grade Boundaries | | | | |
|--------------|---------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| | A | B | C | D | E |
| 135 | 104 | 91 | 79 | 67 | 55 |

A2 Unit 6a (6566/01) – Listening and Writing

Candidates are required to listen to authentic recorded target-language material, to retrieve and convey information by responding to a range of target-language questions and by producing a summary in English.

Although the format is largely similar to that of previous years, the weighting of the assessment objectives within the paper has changed substantially.

Assessment principles

For part one, up to 15 marks are awarded positively for correct information retrieved and conveyed in response to target-language questions. The quality of TL is no longer assessed in 6a; its assessment has been transferred to paper 6b instead.

For part two, up to 15 marks are awarded for English summary skills, showing the ability to understand the gist and details, infer ideas, select information, transfer it and communicate it concisely, and up to 5 marks for GPS.

Summary and GPS are marked using the relevant grids printed in the Change to Specification, notified to centres in June 2003.

Candidates' responses

The tendency to transcribe chunks from the tape rather than to write an answer to the question continued in spite of earlier recommendations. Enough has been said in the past about the dangers connected with lifting from the text. Detailed comments can be found in last years' report or in any of the previous years'.

In part two, a large number of candidates were not concise enough to include sufficient essential detail in the word limit and GPS was not always good even with candidates for whom English is the main language. Predictably, native Italian speakers were the worst affected by the changes in this section of the exam, in that they were no longer credited for the quality of the target language and their weakness in the English summary weighed more heavily on the overall result. The changes favoured candidates that have attained a good level of comprehension of spoken Italian and can rely on good summary skills and standard of written English. Naturally, in the exam as a whole, these differences weigh far less.

Part one

Q1(a) was generally well answered, so was Q1(b) by candidates who read the question properly. Regrettably, a conspicuous number of them overlooked "*a parte l'età*" and provided a non creditable answer.

Q1(c) may have been marred by cultural bias. Possibly over half the candidates assumed that that the US agents went to Italy to offer help rather than to look for it.

Q1(d) showed that a sizeable minority still cannot differentiate between 62 and 72.

Q1(e) proved to be the most difficult to answer correctly. Some candidates did not make any inference and tried to answer (unsuccessfully) by lifting from the text, others assumed that the name High Tech Hate came from the group's hate for technology, an untenable position in the light of the fact that they share a passion for computers. Only a small proportion of candidates scored both marks for this question.

Q1(f)-(i) were well answered apart from some spelling errors, some of which were accepted and some were not. In particular, some renditions of “*carcere*” were a clear indication of failure to understand, as was any mismatched agreement of gender and number in “*il fronte dei buoni*”.

Problems with gender, agreement and even spelling were not infrequent, but these did not affect the assessment except for cases of ambiguity or impaired communication and when they were a clear indication of lack of comprehension.

Part two

To gain full credit in the English summary candidates had to cover all the bullet points in the question, and provide most of the details listed in the mark scheme. These however, only served as a checklist and no strict numerical correspondence between points included and marks awarded for summary was established. The mark awarded reflected the quality of summary skills as shown in the relevant grid.

Most candidates showed good comprehension of the text, but not all of them had the necessary skills to select the appropriate information and communicate it concisely. Instead, many made lengthy reference to the convention in Rome, which was redundant as it wasn't included in the bullet point in the question paper, or lingered on the first few points and then had to omit relevant details from later points or presented them beyond the word count, where they cannot be credited.

Fortunately, only a handful of candidates scored zero because they wrote their summary in Italian and no instance has been brought to my attention this year of candidates summarising Brano 1.

Advice and Guidance

As in previous sessions, teachers are strongly recommended not to neglect the development of the skills that are ancillary to comprehension for a successful completion of this Unit. The comments made in the report for Unit 1 concerning the comprehension of the questions and the ability to identify and select relevant information apply to Unit 6 as well. Additionally, greater care must be taken in developing summary skills, which were shown to be poor in a large number of candidates, Italian and English native speakers alike. This is even more imperative now, given the increased weighting.

Unit 6b (6566/02) – Reading and Writing

Examiner's Report

In this part of the paper candidates are set two questions. In the first they are required to read an authentic text in Italian and respond to a number of target language questions. In the second they are required to translate an English passage of approximately 80 words into the target language. It is important to bear in mind that the passage revolves around the same topic as that used for the first question. Teachers should bring this to the attention of their students as a certain number of words/phrases from the Italian text can be used in this transfer of meaning exercise.

Assessment Principles

Some changes were introduced this year that altered the mark distribution for each of the two questions. These changes were brought to the attention of Centres in a document called Notice to Centres issued in June 2003. These changes meant that 8 marks were awarded for providing the correct content in the answers to the questions (see Mark Scheme) and up to a maximum of 7 marks were awarded for the quality of the target language. However, a scaling process was used and marks for Quality of Language could only be awarded for those answers that contained the correct factual content. The grid used can be found in the document previously mentioned as well as the most recent edition of the Specification (Issue 4, published in October 2003). The fact that the maximum mark for Q1 was 15 meant that the remaining 10 marks available for this paper were allocated to the transfer of meaning exercise. The text for the latter exercise was divided up into 30 assessable elements (see Mark Scheme) and a mark was given for each correct element. The final total was then divided by 3 and marks were rounded down or up accordingly. This system again seemed to work well, proving to be much fairer to students across the ability range and ensuring greater consistency of marking. The change of emphasis on the assessment of Q1 would almost certainly have had an effect on some candidates but this was taken into consideration in the awarding meeting.

Candidates' Responses

The principle underlying the first question is no different from that of the same question type used in the AS paper. Every effort was made to ensure that the questions were put in such a way as not to allow candidates to lift their answers verbatim from the text. It seems that most candidates are getting used to the fact that they have to try and express at least part of the answer in their own words, as stated in the rubric. It is important that teachers explain to their students that they are not expected to find synonyms for every word. In the answer to Q1(e) for example no one is expecting a candidate to find an alternative to *tubazioni*. Many candidates in fact did, using *tubi* or *tubature* but those who used *tube* unfortunately hit the wrong note and consequently the answer fell flat. *Pipe* was not the kind of 'pipe' we were looking for in this context. To gain the mark for content it would have been sufficient to have answered *a causa delle tubazioni vecchie e sconnesse*. The more able candidates who had a better understanding of the text and also a better grasp of the language were able to use more of their own words eg *a cause delle tubazioni rotte che perdono acqua* etc. Whenever possible it is important that candidates do try to express answers as much as possible in their own words given the number of marks that are now awarded for Quality of Language. Those who persist in copying out chunks of the text without making the slightest attempt to manipulate the language are not awarded any marks for these answers. Such answers occasionally take the form of mini essays. Candidates should be guided by the mark allocation for each question.

The question overall proved to be a good test and sufficiently challenging. The very able candidates were able to score high marks for both content and language whereas the less able managed to answer some of the questions reasonably well also gaining some credit for language. However, the weaker of the two assessable elements was certainly the Quality of Language. It does not say much when candidates at this level write *aqua* when the word is used frequently in both the text and the questions themselves. Here are some other examples of poor quality language: *un crisi di acqua per nostro bambini; invece di usando; il problema diventerà più peggio; e sarà una problema per lo futura perché l'acqua nel terra cresce per molti anni*. There were a number of *non* for *no* and *si* for *se* or vice versa. There was the inevitable *firme* for *ditte/compagnie/società* etc in the answer to Q1(g) – a common ‘false friend’!

Q1(a) was generally well answered but some candidates lost the mark because they made no attempt to manipulate the text. Some might have thought that change of word order was manipulation of the text ie *un italiano su tre soffre la sete* but this was not accepted. Q1(b) proved to be one of the more difficult questions as most of the vocabulary in the text was quite difficult. Many of the answers focused on the high percentage of the resources being used by agriculture and industry but the answer required was in the previous sentence. Q1(c) was quite well answered as far as the content was concerned but many candidates had problems expressing the answer in their own words. Most candidates answered Q1(d) correctly. Q1(e) was also very well answered but it did prove difficult for many candidates to express the answer without copying most of the words from the extract. Many of the answers to Q1(f) were either vague *a causa dei chimici*, mainly copied from the text or incomplete in that there was no reference to *l'acqua* or *nell'acqua* depending on how the answer was structured. Q1(g) was generally well answered. The final question allowed candidates to give a personal response with or without reference to the text. Most of the answers made no reference to the text but all answers were accepted as long as they made sense and were in no way contradictory. At least this question gave candidates the freedom to express themselves in their own words and thus access more easily the marks for Quality of Language.

Q2 produced some very mixed results. There were some excellent translations by candidates who remembered to make use of the vocabulary that appeared in the text in Q1 and also had the ability and linguistic competence to cope well with the ‘unseen’ elements. On the other hand, there were some very poor translations by candidates who either failed to use the words from the text referred to or did use them but managed to write some of them incorrectly. Surprisingly at times a number of candidates made rather basic mistakes in their answers to Q1 yet coped much better with the translation task. Rather than leave gaps many candidates at least made an attempt to paraphrase. On occasions this might have been acceptable but on others not, as the rendering was rather too free and oversimplified. Some candidates tried to be over-ambitious and in so doing strayed a little too far from the text. Some of the most common failings included the following: incorrect adjectival agreement; the omission of accents; wrong prepositions; incorrect use of definite articles; lack of awareness of which tense to use. The parts of the passage that proved most difficult to convey accurately were *has been deteriorating for years* and *sales of which*. Very few candidates translated accurately *sales of which* and only a small percentage knew the Italian word for *rivers*. Below are some other common errors:

- e without the accent
- *ha sempre stato*
- *i caldi mesi estivali*
- *nel Italia*
- *è stato peggiorando*
- *è critica*
- *hanno bisogno di*
- *recentamente*
- *più male = peggio*
- *polluzione*
- *sopresa/sorpresa/non è sorpressando/non è sorprenendo*
- *molte persone di più = molte più persone*
- *preferiscono di/a*
- *bevere*
- *hanno aumentato* (instead of *sono aumentate*)

NB: As there was a printing error in the text ie *agricultura* instead of *agricoltura* both of these spellings were accepted.

Advice and guidance

The advice and guidance for Q1 is no different from that which applies to the same question type in Unit 2 at AS level. It is always worth reminding candidates that they are expected to answer the questions as much as possible in their own words, although most candidates seem to be aware of this now and make every effort to comply with this requirement. As already mentioned some answers require less manipulation of the text than others. Candidates should change whatever they can without going overboard and producing answers that become incomprehensible because they lack the grammatical expertise to write with any degree of accuracy. As for Q2 teachers should point out to their students that they do need to stick as closely as possible to the original passage and try and avoid translating too loosely or freely. For those teachers who may be preparing candidates for the first time here are two possible suggestions on how to approach this part of the examination: (i) find a suitable text from an original source – newspaper or magazine – that deals with the same topic that you have been working on and adapt it to your needs by changing/simplifying if necessary some of the structures and vocabulary; (ii) translate a part of an Italian text you have been exploiting with your students into English and get them to translate it back into Italian. However, do not to make the English passage an identical translation of the Italian one. Make some structural changes and alter some of the vocabulary. Inform your students that they will find some of the vocabulary in the Italian text they have been reading. This at least will serve to simulate an exam situation. This kind of activity will help students to focus both on points of grammar and vocabulary acquisition.

A2 Unit 6c (6566/03) – Writing in Registers

A wide range of abilities was demonstrated. Linguistic standards varied as usual but they appeared to have levelled out pointing to a general improvement: again there seemed to be few scripts of very low linguistic standards, although of course there is still a large amount of native or near-native speakers who achieved extremely high linguistic standards.

The best answers were obviously those which fulfilled the three main criteria as indicated by the four mark grids: Creative/Discursive Content or TBA Response to the task: 20 marks; Accuracy of the Target Language: 5 marks; Range and Appropriateness of Lexis: 10 marks; Manipulation of Language: 5 marks.

Candidates are no longer required to demonstrate cultural knowledge of the target-language country in any of their answers.

Content

Section A – Creative Writing

There seemed to be more responses to the creative questions this year, which might indicate more teachers training candidates for this particular style of writing.

Q1 (story about a *lei*) as usual left much scope for imagination. A significant number attempted this question with some very good stories resulting, some more imaginative than others. Predictably the stimulus was often interpreted as a love story and many told similar accounts of a beautiful woman met in the recent past. Some candidates focused too much on past events and did not develop, or even totally ignored, the second part about what would follow. Some stories were very imaginative and considered very different scenarios from the expected love story, others were instead too remote from the stimulus and hardly mentioned a *lei*. Candidates are reminded that their stories have to fit the stimulus, and not vice versa, as they cannot fit a pre-learned story about the stimulus. Most candidates realised the need to write in the first person. The stimulus also provided a chance for very able candidates to demonstrate their knowledge of *passato remoto* (although not contained in the stimulus passage), for which they were duly rewarded.

Q2 (interview with Bruno) was chosen by a growing number of candidates, who possibly are now better trained to write in the form of a dialogue/interview. Only a handful ignored the format requirement and wrote in the form of an article instead. The majority produced good dialogues in an appropriate register about winning a singing competition like *il festival di San Remo* or *Saranno Famosi* or other competitions like *il Grande Fratello* or the national lottery. Candidates often demonstrated a good knowledge of Italian society, which, although not required by the syllabus any more, is always pleasing to read. Again some answers failed to develop the second part of the question about future plans.

Q3 (the wedding ceremony with the dog), the journalistic option, was slightly more popular than in previous years. Most candidates who attempted it wrote a good account of how the couple had met thanks to the dog (often working as volunteers in a rescue centre or else saving the dog from some dreadful fate) and a description of the wedding ceremony, including the role taken by the dog. Some adopted a very good journalistic style, with quotes from the people concerned.

Section B – Discursive Essays

Q4 (Italian artistic heritage) was fairly popular. It produced some standard answers relating to the importance of art/monuments and tourism in general for the Italian economy. Candidates often demonstrated a good knowledge of Italian cultural heritage, with links to art and architecture or Italian historic past, and were quite good at explaining reasons in favour of maintaining artwork. However the disadvantages were often overlooked and many did not really consider alternatives to government spending (eg to solve other problems in Italy and the wider world relating to education, poverty, crime etc.), thus producing unbalanced answers.

Q5 (organic farming) was less popular. There were some good responses, which considered the problem of agricultural pollution, due to chemicals and pesticides in the soil and rivers. Some read the question differently and argued that organic farming isn't the best solution to ecological problems because there are other things that need to be dealt with first, eg car pollution/the greenhouse effect. This interpretation was partly accepted but could not constitute the main body of the essay, being mostly irrelevant to the issue of organic farming and agricultural pollution. There were a few instances of candidates who confused *agricoltura biologica* with GM food.

Q6 (city versus countryside) was probably the most popular one this year. Again, this question, being a well rehearsed topic at A Level, produced standard answers about air and noise pollution, stressful life and the cost of living in the big cities as opposed to a peaceful and cheaper, albeit boring, life in the country or a smaller town. Most candidates produced a structured response analysing advantages and disadvantages of both options but some ended their essays rather abruptly without a suitable conclusion.

Q7 (superstition) was a challenging question and not all candidates managed to grasp its full implications. Most argued that superstition remains with us, although only a few were able to provide examples to support their point of view. Many candidates ended up making rather irrelevant points, talking for example at great length about religion and thus missing the main point of the question.

Section C – Task Based Assignments

Q8 (TBA on the Venice exchange) was the most popular out of the two Task Based Assignments, although both TBAs as usual produced many responses (and, as usual, often from weaker candidates). Most candidates wrote a suitable response to the stimulus email, with the best answers being the ones that closely followed the bullet points. Many displayed a good knowledge of Venice and its attractions but some tended to expand too much on what they wanted to do in Venice (and at times even to say what the Italian group could do in England on their return exchange, which was totally irrelevant). Where candidates had expanded too much on the second bullet point, they often dealt superficially with the other points, either the first one on why the exchange would be a valuable experience or the last one about further information. Some candidates also did not realise the need for a formal register or else failed to maintain a consistent use of *Lei/Voi*, often lapsing into *tu*, and therefore losing marks. From the language point of view, many used the word *clarificazione*, which actually does not exist in Italian.

Q9 (TBA on the job application) was a popular choice, although less so than Q8. Most candidates showed a clear understanding of the task and dealt well with the three bullet points, particularly when outlining their past experiences. Some candidates, however, failed to specify which job they were applying for. Others lifted too much material from the adverts, not always appropriately. Most were better aware of the need to use the formal letter format for this task and therefore used an appropriate register, with only a few again struggling with the *Lei/voi* register and lapsing into *tu*. Most seemed familiar with the appropriate opening and closing expressions for formal letters/emails.

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. They are also reminded that they have to answer only one question out of the whole papers; there are still some who answer more than one.

Language

Accuracy of the Target Language

Although accuracy tended to be variable, the examiners noticed a general improvement in the overall levels of accuracy. Wrong verb endings and agreements are still the most common errors, together with a widespread misuse of prepositions.

Range & Appropriateness of Lexis

Most candidates used an appropriate and fairly varied range of lexis, with stronger candidates again displaying a very good knowledge of topic-specific vocabulary, especially in the Discursive Essays section. Spelling was generally quite accurate, although, as usual, some candidates still make minor errors even in the spelling of rather common words, such as *t(o)urismo* or *giov(n)i*, and words such as *meglio* or *migliore* are often not used correctly, being replaced simply by *più buono* or even *più meglio!* Most candidates showed a good sense of register, with only a few struggling to deal with the TBAs formal register.

Manipulation of Language

This grid has been reintroduced this year to assess the Quality of Language in terms of structures rather than grammatical accuracy. Again, the examiners commented positively on the degree of attempted manipulation of language, which this year seemed to be much better than in previous years, with many candidates displaying good use of the conditional tense and hypothetical sentence structure, including the imperfect subjunctive. However, the subjunctive in general was often misused, being applied even when it was not required.

| Maximum Mark | Unit 6 Grade Boundaries | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| | A | B | C | D | E |
| 100 | 71 | 63 | 55 | 48 | 41 |

GRADE AWARDS AND UNIFORM MARK SYSTEM IN MODULAR AS/A2 MODERN LANGUAGES

Grade Award Procedure

Candidates' work is graded unit by unit at the award meeting. The **unit** grade boundaries E and A are determined by inspection of candidates' work in each unit/paper. For each unit the grade B, C and D boundaries are calculated by dividing the mark interval between the A and E boundaries by 4. Where there is a remainder of 1 the extra mark is added to the A-B mark range. Where there is a remainder of 2, 1 extra mark is added to each of the A-B and the B-C mark ranges. Where there is a remainder of 3, 1 extra mark is added to the A-B, B-C and C-D mark ranges.

The **subject** grade boundaries A, B, C, D, E are determined by aggregating the module performances on the Uniform Mark System (see below).

Comparability of Options

In the interests of comparability across the Advanced level options, the papers in each language are set and moderated by a team consisting of the Chair of Examiners, Chief Examiner, Principal Examiners and Revisers who check and compare the draft papers; the units/papers are marked and graded on the same basis, with the Chair of Examiners having an overall co-ordinating role for the subject as a whole. The examiners for the different languages liaise as closely as possible on question paper setting and mark scheme construction.

At each examination the Chair of Examiners, Chief Examiner and Principal Examiners scrutinise and compare candidates' performance on common papers and on option papers. The aim is to secure comparability of standards and fairness to all candidates regardless of which options they take. The option papers are graded using grade boundaries which may differ from option to option depending on the examiners' judgement of the overall comparability of papers and candidates' performance.

The examiners are required to take into account the difficulty/accessibility of the papers and the performance of candidates by comparison with previous examinations and to determine unit/paper grade boundaries which maintain the closest possible year-on-year consistency of standards: to help in this process, statistics on previous examinations together with the relevant question papers and archive scripts are made available for reference at the grade award stage. A more difficult paper taken by a comparable candidature which produced lower average marks than at the previous examination session would lead to lower grade boundaries; there could well be a number of grade boundary variations across modules/papers from examination to examination.

Uniform Mark System

The result for each unit is issued as a standardised mark on a uniform mark scale. This ensures that all unit results are put into the module bank on a standardised basis regardless of when the units are taken. The process for arriving at module and overall subject results is as follows:

Each unit is marked using the mark scheme and the maximum mark shown in the syllabus. Grade boundaries are set for each unit at the award meeting. The grade boundary marks are converted to the uniform marks shown in the table below, with the intermediate values calculated accordingly. The overall subject grade then depends on the aggregate of the uniform marks across the units.

Candidates may cash in their AS and/or A2 results at the end of their course or they may decline to cash them in if they plan to re-take some or all units to improve their results. The rules for banking modules, cashing in results, and declining results are given in the Edexcel Information Manual which has been issued to all centres.

Grade Boundary tables

The Grade Boundary tables for the UMS can be found on the following page.

**ADVANCED SUBSIDIARY
Modern Languages Uniform Mark System**

| SUBJECT | | UNIT | | |
|---------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Grade | | Weighting 30% | Weighting 40% | Weighting 30% |
| | UM 300 max | UM 90 max | UM 120 max | UM 90 max |
| A | 240 | 72 | 96 | 72 |
| B | 210 | 63 | 84 | 63 |
| C | 180 | 54 | 72 | 54 |
| D | 150 | 45 | 60 | 45 |
| E | 120 | 36 | 48 | 36 |
| N | 90 | 27 | 36 | 27 |

**ADVANCED LEVEL
Modern Languages Uniform Mark System**

| SUBJECT | | UNIT | | | | | |
|---------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Grade | | Weighting 15% | Weighting 20% | Weighting 15% | Weighting 15% | Weighting 15% | Weighting 20% |
| | UM 600 max | UM 90 max | UM 120 max | UM 90 max | UM 90 max | UM 90 max | UM 120 max |
| A | 480 | 72 | 96 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 96 |
| B | 420 | 63 | 84 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 84 |
| C | 360 | 54 | 72 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 72 |
| D | 300 | 45 | 60 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 60 |
| E | 240 | 36 | 48 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 48 |
| N | 180 | 27 | 36 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 36 |

MAKING ENTRIES FOR AS/A2 IN MODERN LANGUAGES

Teachers are advised to liaise with their Examinations Officers to ensure that their students are correctly entered for the AS/A examinations. Full information on the administrative aspects and entry procedures is given in *The Information Manual*.

The entry procedure may be summarised as follows:

1. All candidates must be entered for the relevant units using the **unit numbers** and the appropriate **option codes**.
2. At any examination session where candidates will be eligible for the award of an overall AS or A subject grade and wish to claim a certificate the candidates must also be entered using the overall **syllabus reference numbers**: these reference numbers are known as **cash-in codes**.

TRAINING COURSES FOR 2004-2005

A programme of training courses has been arranged for teachers preparing candidates for the AS/A examinations in modern foreign languages. Information regarding the national programme of training for the 2004-2005 academic year is available on the website (www.edexcel.org.uk) and via regular mail outs of information to centres throughout the year. Further guidance on training is available from: Professional Development and Training, Edexcel, Stewart House, 32 Russell Square, London WC1B 5DN, tel. 0870 240 9800, fax. 020 7758 5951, E-mail: trainingenquiries@edexcel.org.uk.

SPECIFICATION AND TEACHERS' HANDBOOK

A Teachers' Handbook for the modern languages specification is available for £6.00 (plus pp) from Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts NG18 4LN; direct tel. 01623 467 467, fax. 01623 450 481; E-mail: publications@linneydirect.co.uk. The publication code to quote for the Teachers' Handbook is UA007563.

The Handbook gives further guidance on modularity, non-literary topics, literature taught and tested through the target language, the unit 3 and 4/1 oral tests, and Information Technology in language learning; it contains bilingual literary glossaries for French, German, Italian, Russian, Spanish and Urdu.

A Coursework Guide and Oral Training Guide are also available from publications.

Centres requiring extra copies of the **AS/A2 specification** booklet should obtain them from Edexcel Publications.

Publication order code: MFL Specification UA006082

The specification and specimen papers are also available on the Edexcel website: <http://www.edexcel.org.uk>.

© London Qualifications Limited 2004

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

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Order Code UA015399 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