GCSE EXAMINERS' REPORTS

FRENCH

SUMMER 2009

Statistical Information

The Examiners' Report may refer in general terms to statistical outcomes. Statistical information on candidates' performances in all examination components (whether internally or externally assessed) is provided when results are issued. As well as the marks achieved by individual candidates, the following information can be obtained from these printouts:

For each component: the maximum mark, aggregation factor, mean mark and standard deviation of marks obtained by *all* candidates entered for the examination.

For the subject or option: the total entry and the lowest mark needed for the award of each grade.

Annual Statistical Report

Other information on a centre basis is provided when results are issued. The annual *Statistical Report* (issued in the second half of the Autumn Term) gives overall outcomes of all examinations administered by WJEC.

FRENCH

General Certificate of Secondary Education 2009

Joint Chief Examiners: David Thomas M.A. (Oxon) M.Ed (Wales), PGCE (Wales), Head of Modern Languages and Continuing Professional Development Co-ordinator, Maelor School, Penley, Wrexham.

Louise Pearce B.A.Hons, University of Kent. DESS. Université de Savoie, Chambéry, PGCE University College Swansea. Director of Learning for MFL, Pencoed Comprehensive School, Bridgend.

Listening and Responding

General Comments:

It is pleasing to report that candidates have been well prepared for the listening and responding examination. Fewer candidates this year lost marks by failing to answer in the correct language. Many candidates made good use of the “Rough Notes” space to write down the meaning of the French questions or other vocabulary items in order to help them choose correctly and they should be encouraged to continue to do this. Candidates at both Foundation and Higher Tier seem to have found the examination accessible and were for the most part entered at the correct level.

Some candidates seem to use the time before the tape begins profitably by circling the mark allocation and noting key vocabulary under pictures etc. Question rubric had been revised which was evident in the candidates’ annotations. These examination techniques demonstrate the very good practice taking place in most centres.

Numbers are still posing a problem and some candidates continue to persist in trying to write them in words, even when the instructions on the front explicitly state that figures are acceptable. This frequently results in errors being made and a loss of marks. While parts of questions may have been omitted on occasions, there were very few candidates who did not attempt whole sections.

Although there were only 2 sections in the higher tier to be answered briefly in French, some candidates didn’t demonstrate that they could write accurately in the target language. On occasions, candidates wrote too much and in this paper brief answers are adequate.

Foundation Tier:

Q.1 For the most part, candidates answered this question well. The majority of candidates ticked 2 boxes owing to the clear layout of the questions and the mark indicated in brackets next to each table. There were only 1 or 2 cases of too many or too few boxes ticked.

Q.2 Some candidates only ticked one image in (a) and one image in (b) in spite of the clear indication of marks below each box.

(a) A considerable number of candidates did not tick the reading image: swimming or computer was ticked for (a), many did not tick ‘book’ in (b).
(b) A few candidates ticked the ‘gardening’ picture.
(c) Not many correct answers for *Pierre et Aurélie*, which is a little surprising as many candidates had ticked reading for both people in a) and b).

Q.3 This question was generally done well with few errors.

(a) Some candidates ticked ‘bus’ or ‘car’ instead of ‘train’.
(b) *Supermarché* was ticked by a number of candidates instead of *Café.*
(c) ‘Swimming pool’ or ‘cinema’ often ticked instead of *musée* seemingly at random by some candidates.
(d) Some problems with numbers still - €3 and 16h00 often selected instead of €5 and 17h00.

Q.4 On the whole, this question was usually done well, with most candidates managing to select the correct images . However, some candidates indicated that *chemise* was not well known and *taille moyenne* proved difficult for some candidates. Several candidates didn’t know *jupe*, so ticked at random *chapeau* or *robe* and *gants* was often selected instead of *chaussures*. It was evident that some pupils had not learnt clothing items. There were also a few problems with numbers from weaker candidates.

Q.5 This question was answered well and did not seem to pose many problems at all. Most candidates selected correctly throughout. However, there were occasional errors. A few candidates made the following errors:

(a) *A pied* often selected instead of *voiture*.
(b) Numbers caused problems for some – time difficult for weaker candidates.
(c) ‘Bar’ often selected instead of “information”.
(d) *6 heures* often selected incorrectly but most candidates did well.
(e) *Poisson* sometimes selected but most candidates selected *poulet* correctly.
(f) *Soleil* often selected correctly but still quite a number of candidates selected *vent* not having inferred meaning from the script.

Q.6 Generally the best answered question on the paper. Candidates had obviously retained the theme of food well! The main error was the incorrect choice of food in (b), with potatoes being selected instead of onions.

Q.7 (a) For the most part this question was answered well. A few candidates gave the incorrect answer 'right'. Some candidates added superfluous information e.g left of the town/ of the river etc. Some references to the Loire were given and had been taken from the setting rather than script.

(b) Most candidates understood at least 1 of the correct answers (brother/ cousins) but often had the second one incorrect (although this was not penalised) e.g. brother and friend/ father and cousin etc. At least 2 candidates thought he had taken ***his cat*** canoeing! (From *quatre*?) Occasionally "friends" or "family" were given as incorrect alternatives.

(c) A few candidates found difficulty with number recognition and time references. Common mistakes included: "12/10 hours" instead of "2 hours". Other problems included '2 weeks' instead of '2 hours'.

(d) *Oiseaux* presented some difficulty but some candidates gave the answer - "watched the swans/ the parrots/the duck/seagulls/wildlife". Other incorrect answers that were given included "watched the boats/scenery, being with friends or just canoeing".

(e) Many candidates managed to express the idea of "calm/peace/tranquillity". Occasionally *Cannes* was offered instead of *calme.*

(f) Mostly answered correctly – a few £ instead of Euro although sometimes difficult to decipher. A few candidates made the mistake of 50 Euros instead of 15.

HIGHER LEVEL

Q.1 See comments for question 7 Foundation Tier.

Q.2 See comments for question 5 Foundation Tier.

Q.3 See comments for question 6 Foundation Tier.

Q.4 Answered in French by most or all candidates, no rubric problems. However the French spelling of common words was not very good compared to previous years' scripts. Not many candidates scored full marks on this page. Some candidates answered Section 1 correctly but wrote their answers on the wrong lines.

(a) Mostly done well by candidates. Errors which were made included the spelling of *sac* which was often written as "sack or *cinq*"

(b) Answered well by candidates and was rarely incorrect.

(c) Time was usually written in figures but even if given in words, most candidates usually spelt correctly or almost correctly. Some candidates gave *matin* only (credited) but also some gave *matin* with an incorrect time (*12.30/ 10.00).* This indicated confusion by some candidates.

(d) Generally a well answered question. However weaker candidates misspelt *centre* and often spelt 'sentre'. *Ville* was sometimes spelt 'vile' or 'vil'.

(e)-(k) Generally answered well. Candidates who made errors ticked too many or too few boxes. Use of the mark scheme indicated to candidates the number needed.

Q.5 There was a mixed performance to this question. Some candidates didn't know this vocabulary or expressions while others had evidently covered illnesses and did well.

Q.6 (a) Generally answered correctly with *Paris* being given. Occasionally a few candidates wrote "Barry"

(b) The majority of pupils knew this answer. However a wide variation of spelling was evident. A few candidates took the option of writing *prof* instead (credited).

(c) Too many candidates tried to spell the number instead of writing figures and lost marks as a result.

(d) Some candidates mixed up their numbers on this question and instead of *deux* the following numbers were offered - "12 and 10!" Poor Juliette Binoche!

(e) Many candidates answered this question correctly and some candidates cleverly used synonyms. Weaker candidates encountered difficulty with the spelling of the word *peinture*. Many candidates spelt it "painture" or "paintre" "Panto / pantomime" was also mentioned by some candidates.

(f) Most candidates coped well with this question and provided the answer *film* or *voyage*. However few candidates managed the full response of *films internationaux* or *beaucoup de voyages*.

(g) Candidates were not as successful on this question. Few managed the correct answer of *Oscar* and the alternative of *prix* was rarely attempted.

Gagner was frequently misspelt by the majority of candidates and sometimes *garnier* was written instead. The way that *un Oscar* was written (*une scar* etc) suggests that candidates had not understood the answer and were trying to write the sound. *Le film préféré* was also a frequent answer.

(h) This question was rarely done well. Many had obviously had several attempts at the answer but still incorrectly chose (ii) *Elle préfère les films historiques*

(i) Generally answered well, with many candidates giving the correct answer *refusé* or one of the accepted alternatives. A few candidates chose the option of saying *France est plus importante* which was also credited.

Administration

Generally centres are using the correct procedures for forwarding scripts to examiners. However there are instances where problems have been encountered. Examples of the problems encountered include:

- No information on the outside of the packet other than the Centre Number. The front should also indicate the title and paper number of the scripts inside.
- No indication of the total number of scripts in the packet.
- No indication as to whether the packet was part of a larger consignment e.g. 1 of 3.
- An attendance list taped to the outside of a packet like a delivery note.
- Foundation and Higher papers packed together in the same envelope.
- Too many papers squashed into one packet, often arriving split.

<u>Speaking</u>

General Comments

Generally administration by centres was good. For the most part tapes arrived promptly. However there are still a few centres which do not record the centre name / number/session/role play set on the mark sheets/ tape boxes. A few centres do not necessarily examine the foundation candidates before the higher. For the most part candidates were entered at the correct level. The quality of recordings was generally satisfactory, although some examiners had difficulty with audibility. Some centres had problems with noise levels outside the examining room and some centres stopped the tape as a result. It is advised that the examining rooms are kept as quiet as possible to ensure quality recordings. Assistant examiners have many candidates to listen to and it would be appreciated if centres could rewind their tapes at the end of examining. Where digital recordings/ CDs were used the clarity of recordings facilitated marking. Mispronunciations weaken some speaking examinations and common errors included:

- Poule, for pull
- Blanc, sounding the c
- Meurci, for merci
- Our, for heure
- Enterprize, for enterprise
- Interestant
- Enuiyeuxe, for ennuyeux
- Employe, employ
- Seste, c’est
- Anz, for ans
- Zeuxx for yeux
- Chevexxx for cheveux
- Generalemente, sound the ente at the end of the adverbs

Conversation

Most centres ensured that the prescribed topic was covered albeit briefly in some cases. An increasing number of teachers seem to have a “bank” of questions which touch on all topics to some extent but do not always develop a topic sufficiently. There is less evidence of spontaneity and unpredictability and some candidates are so well prepared that they come dangerously close to being capped at Band 4 . This is a great shame as it is primarily the better pupils who fall into this trap. Despite this, there were some good, natural, fluent conversations which merited full marks. However, this year there was insufficient evidence of a sustained conversation from many higher candidates and while some seemed confident, there were a large number of grammatical errors and limited sentence structure. At foundation level, the majority of candidates were able to respond adequately to be in Band 3 or 4. However they were not always given the opportunity to display sufficient use of tenses to achieve band 5.

In a few centres, at higher level, some pupils spoke for too long and the lengthy conversations did not improve with extra time. Some teacher examiners did not follow up answers and just rapidly fired a list of questions at the candidates, not allowing conversations to develop. Many centres demonstrated good practice in their questioning technique in order to push the more able pupils, giving them the opportunity to give opinions, justifications and a range of tenses. Some teacher examiners were really patient and questioned really well the less motivated pupils in order to get the best level for their candidates.

Role Plays

General Observations

Candidates at both levels are generally able to cope with the demands of the role plays. Having said this asking questions and asking or offering help can still pose a problem for some candidates. For the most part, candidates could ask *c’est combien?* However many candidates struggled with formulating other questions. A lot of candidates answered the question instead of asking the question. For the most part candidates coped well with transactional role plays. At foundation level, candidates performed better when they had to order food or a souvenir. They were not so confident with clothes and sizes.

In a few centres, teacher examiners are not giving enough time to the candidates to think when they ask the unpredictable question. Some are too quick to reword the question and a few candidates lost marks as a result. When giving their age, some candidates are still saying *je suis*. When reading the prompt in French, weaker candidates are still unsure how to adapt it. The majority of candidates are very confident with the use of *je voudrais* and in expressing opinions.

<u>Set 1</u>

Foundation RP 1

1. Various items sought. Pronunciation of *pull* presented problems but *jean/ pantalon/tee-shirts* were more frequently given.
2. Most were able to correctly ask for *grand* or *petit.* Candidates offering a number need to watch their pronunciation.
3. Answered well. Candidates know their colours. Some colours mispronounced e.g. *blanc.*
4. Many confused *je n’aime pas* with *je n’ai pas.*
5. Mostly correct, although some candidates forgot to say 1 of the prompts.

Foundation RP2 Higher RP1

1. Most candidates chose to give their name and age (mostly correct but some 5 or 6 year olds!) 1 examiner even heard "*J'ai 6 ans et je suis un lapin!"*A few were keen to mention their personal qualities as this was a job interview.
2. Some confusion of tense but mostly fine.
3. Sometimes *interestant* was given. However there were fewer mis-pronunciations than in the past.
4. This question was not readily understood by a number of candidates. Tendency for some teachers to prompt with *Combien d'argent?* Some difficulty expressing currency – mispronunciation of *euros, livres* not readily known. Some candidates thought the question was asking them what they did in work experience.
5. *A quelle heure* was more frequent than *quand*. Some difficulty with *job* and question form. Some pupils answered and did not ask the question.

Higher RP2

1. Asking for help still poses difficulties. Pronunciation of *aider* was poor.
2. *J'ai perdu* was done quite well. Most used *sac*. Those who attempted *valise* often made errors. *Mon cass* was a frequent response.
3. Most candidates were able to give colour and/ or size.
4. Some confusion of tense – past instead of present.
5. Most candidates were able to express an opinion.

<u>Set 2</u>

Foundation RP1

1. Well understood and answered.
2. Usual confusion of *Coke/ coca/ cola* or *limonade/ lemonade.*
3. *Heure* known but difficulty asking the question.
4. Mostly correct.
5. Most able to answer correctly.

Foundation RP2 Higher RP1

1. As for set 1.
2. Mostly correct.
3. Some confusion with teacher prompt and candidate prompt but most used candidate prompt with *je suis allé/ j'ai joué* etc.
4. Fine for most part.
5. Again difficulty with question form.

Higher RP2

1. As for Set 1.
2. *J'ai rate/ j'ai manqué* not well known. Some attempts with *Où est le train ?* Some candidates found difficulty in not knowing how to say they had missed their train. Some better candidates cleverly got around this problem by stating that the train had left.
3. Candidates performed well in this question.
4. Most were able to mention a member of the family correctly.
5. Mostly acceptable answers.

Set 3

Foundation RP1

1. Most correctly asked for *un stylo.*
2. *Pour* omitted by many so ½ mark.
3. Mostly correct although *C'est* omitted by some.
4. Mostly correct although some *Pays de Galles* instead of *gallois.*
5. As for set 1.

Foundation RP2 Higher RP1

1. As for Set 1.
2. Most stated where they worked rather than described what they did.
3. Mostly correct. Many gave 1 subject but were prompted by the teacher to give an additional one.
4. Mostly answered well.
5. Again difficulty with word for job.

Higher RP2

1. As for Set 1.
2. Mis-pronunciation of *billet/ticket.*
3. Most understood question. Dans le bus/ train/ au centre ville frequent answers.
4. Various activities but mostly acceptable.
5. Many referred to *Ma ville* but gave an acceptable opinion.

Set 4

Foundation RP1

1. Variety of items but mostly acceptable.
2. *C'est tout* not widely known. Some attempts with just *non* or *non merci*
3. Answered well.
4. Anglicised pronunciation of *banque*. Very few used *Pour aller* . Mainly just the place or *où est?*
5. Answered well.

Foundation RP2 Higher RP1

1. As for Set 1
2. Generally answered well. Sometimes use of *travailler* for travelled.
3. Good expression of opinions.
4. Mostly correct.
5. Many were able to rephrase and said *A quelle heure je commence et finis*. However still some difficulty with asking questions.

Higher RP2

1. As for Set 1
2. Not all understood that money had been lost. Some said *je voudrais de l'argent*. Some *agent* or *monnaie* for *argent.*
3. A few candidates needed the prompt repeated as they did not know *portefeuille.* However the majority of candidates answered correctly.
4. Most able to give an acceptable activity.
5. Answered very well.

WRITING

FTQ1

The majority of candidates was able to communicate the necessary information although many relied on repeated use of *je fais.* Very commonly candidates were unable to conjugate the verbs so infinitives followed by a noun were common such as *laver la voiture.* Some candidates seemed to miss the “help around” in the rubric and wrote a *routine quotidienne* which, in others, merged with the actual question to produce e.g. *je me lave la voiture.* There was frequent misuse of nouns in an attempt to express activities so that *je promenade/je pied le chien* was very common. Possessives were not handled well so *laver mon pères/ma mères voiture* was common.

FTQ2

Most candidates were able to communicate most of the information with “how old they are” proving the hardest to get right. There were some pleasing and extended attempts at describing a member of the family (sometimes the dog!) and saying something about the house or area (which needed to be more than just an address).

FTQ3/HTQ1

Three general comments can be made about the demands of both options (a) and (b) of this question. First, though the formula for the beginning and ending of both letters, being informal, is very simple a surprising number of candidates failed to write even one, let alone both, correctly. Secondly, within the body of the letters each of the 8 tasks should be treated more or less equally. Failure to do so is likely to result in a low mark being awarded for Communication (and probably, by consequence, Quality of Language). Thirdly, a variety of tenses *must* be employed here in order to obtain full marks. The first task establishes that these events took place in the past and this needs to be communicated unambiguously by candidates.

Q3a/1a

What might have seemed an attractive question – as it referred to sport – turned out to be problematic in its execution for many candidates as they had difficulties distinguishing between what the event was and what they did as participants or spectators. Many also struggled to say how long the event lasted with something like *durée 4 heures* being common. The last task – asking a question – was not accomplished successfully by most candidates with few using *quel.* In general many candidates used the prompt to “say exactly what you did” to write an answer composed mainly of what they did *after* the event e.g. going to a restaurant.

Q3b/1b

This question was a less popular choice but produced many interesting accounts including one, apparently original, detailing the adventures of Harry Patter. Many candidates used *genre* in their attempt to ask about the *sort* of book their penfriend read. The most difficult task seemed to be stating the author even though it could have completed by *de.*

HTQ2a

This was by far the most popular choice with some interesting responses though some fell short by not giving opinions or, more commonly, by not justifying those they did offer. Many candidates used the conditional tense widely and accurately though there was some uncertainty in expressions that were not in the first person singular. The vast majority of candidates intended – usually in this order - to buy luxury objects, go on exotic holidays, help out their parents and donate money to charity. One altruistic candidate would use her fortune to *acheter de nouveaux dents pour ma grand'mère*. Some were conscious of the danger of losing friends through gaining their unexpected wealth while others were hoping to meet the *fille de mes rêves.*

HTQ2b

Again, there were some interesting responses though many answers seemed curiously out-of-date and did not reflect the current issues regarding the threats to the environment.

HTQ3c

Few candidates attempted this question and many struggled to express their ideas clearly not even using the vocabulary given to them in the question - *stars célèbres.* The concept of arguing for or against whether the stars are *trop importantes* proved beyond the reach of nearly all candidates.

READING

In spite of the fact that in most questions candidates had only to choose from a selection of answers offered to them and in FTQ5/HTQ1 had only to think of an answer, *any answer,* in English a surprising number left blanks or made no attempt to choose from the options available.

FTQ1

Very few candidates scored full marks in this question with *dortoir* in particular not being recognised although *cave* and *bureau* also posed problems. However *lavabos* and *bibliothèque* were almost always correct. Some candidates included letters which were not even an option e.g. K!

FTQ2

This question was answered very well although some candidates linked *géographie* with *langues étrangères.*

FTQ3

There were very few completely correct answers with *gare* and *gare routière* being routinely confused. In spite of the varied quality of the pictures it was not possible to determine whether this had had any discernible effect on candidates' performance.

FTQ4/HTQ2

This question was not well answered either at Foundation or Higher Tier with the main problem being not the individual items of vocabulary but the *context* (the future tense in particular) in which they were used and the *inference* required to determine which days were *relatively* warm*er* or cold*er* and so on. Some candidates' spelling of the days of the week (printed for them in the text) was approximate.

FTQ5/HTQ1

As well as leaving blanks or answering in French (when *any* answer in English had at least a chance of being correct) many candidates abandoned any logical reasoning in their answers. Candidates may find it useful to read the questions before the text in order to give them some idea as to its meaning or at least its general context. Overall candidates entered at Higher Tier did better at these questions than those entered at Foundation Tier.

(i) This was fairly well answered although many candidates gave *bus* or *parents,* showing how important it is to read to the end of the sentence before jumping to conclusions.
(ii) *Grève* was not well known but, at Higher Tier at least, some candidates did infer that the buses were not running and so gained a mark.
(iii) *8.30* was a common answer here, once again illustrating the need to read to the end of the sentence.
(iv) *Soldes,* as in previous years, was unfamiliar to many candidates.
(v) *Sympa* was a popular answer as it does appear in the text and is, presumably, better known than *fâché.*
(vi) Very few candidates answered this correctly with many inventing appropriate replies including the general "full Welsh breakfast" and the specific "duck" or "fish".
(vii) A huge number of candidates wrote either "his little friend" or "Duffy" while others gave "his bird" or "his woman".
(viii) Almost nobody recognised *incendie* so "tired" or, often, "tiered" featured along with the very common "incident" and the less common "indecent". Others linked it to the impending *contrôle de physique* and said that he had a "physical test/control". Popular answers, perhaps drawing on candidates' own experience, were "there was a fight", "he was underage", "he looked young", "he had no control over his body" and "he had to be home before morning".

HTQ3

This question was generally well answered though the answers for (i) and (iii) were often interchanged.

HTQ4

This was answered correctly by nearly all candidates.

HTQ5

There were some all-correct answers but many candidates failed to obtain the second mark for saying that Parc Astérix was *nord de Paris* in (i) or for not stating the two days (*jours* in the question) which made up the weekend (iii). Many gave Toussaint or Noel as answers for (iii).

HTQ6

This question, apart from (iii) and (v) was fairly well answered although there was a tendency, once again, to copy our chunks of the text in the hope of including the answer, a practice which, almost always, does not gain the candidate credit.

(i) Most candidates spotted *télé* but many struggled with the concept of *partager.*
(ii) This was usually correct.
(iii) Candidates who did not read to the end of the sentence or did not pick up the *ce qui énerve mes profs* usually gave a version of *copier les devoirs.*
(iv) Many candidates lost marks by not including *de camion* or wrote something like *aller en Allemagne.* A common mistake was to include *devenir* (copying the text).
(v) Few candidates included the full answer required and many did not distinguish between the activities of Saturday afternoon and evening, assuming that the last question on the paper had to refer to the final paragraph in the text! Some turned *marché* into a verb e.g. *il marché au stade.*

Coursework

Most centres are now completing **administrative tasks** correctly though a few continue to:

- send coursework in envelopes or plastic wallets instead of the A4 envelope files specified.
- list their full cohort on the F2a/bi forms instead of just the sample.
- list candidates on the above forms in alphabetical instead of rank order.

This year there was marked increase in the number of clerical errors. These are usually composed of:

- totalling up the separate marks for Communication and Quality of Language incorrectly.
- transferring the marks incorrectly from the scripts to the cover and rank order sheets.
- putting the wrong marks against individual answers even though the candidate's total/100 or /120 is correct.

In terms of the **Tasks** completed the vast majority of centres choose all their questions verbatim from the Task Bank. Inconsistencies occur, however, with the following questions:

FTQ5/HTQ1

The rubric insists on *one* film/programme/sport/group. Many candidates, however, write about more than one example of the chosen genre and some spend half their recommended word total on a general introduction to their chosen topic.

HTQ5D

The rubric asks candidates to write about their *collège idéal* but many candidates spend an inordinate amount of time writing about what they like or dislike about their current school and some write a potted history of their schooling up to that point! In addition many fail to provide any justification for their opinions which must be present if marks from the top band for Communication are awarded.

HTQ4A

Similarly candidates do not always write about their *ideal* holiday or justify their points of view.

HTQ4B&4

Though not popular choices it is worth remembering that these are *higher tier* questions and as such must pass beyond merely personal accounts of how the candidate spends money or what the candidates wears.

Annotation

Continues to be a problem - The Coursework Guidelines offer clear instructions (p4 “Marking” and p 5 “When you are marking the coursework”) regarding what should appear on candidates’ scripts. Some teachers continue to annotate (and correct) work to such an extent that *it is not possible* to see what the candidate has written. There is absolutely no point in a teacher adding accents or inserting or changing auxiliary verbs for example. If coursework is to be used for formative assessment then a photocopy should be annotated in such a way but the original marked according to the Board’s guidelines. In other cases, however, scripts lacked sufficient annotation to support the marks given and in some cases there was no sign, other than the mark given, that a teacher had read the script at all.

There has been a noticeable increase this year in the use of inappropriate media such as pencils and highlighter pens and also of correcting fluid. Pupils completing coursework should work under, more or less, the same conditions as candidates in an exam and the *only medium* that is required is a (preferably black) pen.

This year there was also an increase in the number of candidates who wrote in bullet points whereas, even for the FT Q 1 – 3, continuous prose is necessary to rise above the lowest bands for Quality of Language.

While most **marks awarded by teachers** fall within the range tolerated by the WJEC there are centres that are generous, often at the lower ends of both FT and HT, where there remains confusion as to the interpretation of *serious* and *minor* and *frequent* and *some* errors.

Marks to Grades

Below are the marks needed to gain each of the grades available at foundation and higher tier in each component of the 2009 French examination. It must be emphasised, however, that those marks are relevant only to that examination. As the difficulty level of papers cannot be known precisely in advance, the marks needed for each of the grades may vary from year to year. (The total marks are given in brackets after the index for each component.

Foundation Tier

Grades	**Writing 01 (50)**	**Listening 02 (40)**	**Reading 03 (40)**	**Speaking 04 (40)**	**Coursework 09 (100)**
C	35	34	21	32	76
D	27	27	18	25	60
E	19	20	15	19	45
F	12	14	12	13	30
G	5	8	9	7	15

Higher Tier

Grades	**Writing 05 (50)**	**Listening 06 (40)**	**Reading 07 (40)**	**Speaking 08 (40)**	**Coursework 10 (120)**
A*	42	38	31	35	105
A	35	35	26	31	94
B	28	31	21	27	83
C	22	27	17	23	73
D	15	19	12	17	60
E	11	15	9	14	53

**N.B. The marks given above are raw marks and not uniform marks.*

Cumulative Percentages of candidates achieving Grades A* - G (Provisional figures).

Total number of candidates - 11,860.

Grade

A*	7.8%
A	24.7%
B	45.6%
C	68.3%
D	86.5%
E	95.5%
F	98.9%
G	99.7%

Grade Awarding - UMS

Candidates' raw marks in each component are converted to a mark on the following *Uniform Mark Scale:*

A*	320-360
A	280-319
B	240-279
C	200-239
D	160-199
E	120-159
F	80-119
G	40- 79
U	0- 39

WJEC
245 Western Avenue
Cardiff CF5 2YX
Tel No 029 2026 5000
Fax 029 2057 5994
E-mail: exams@wjec.co.uk
website: www.wjec.co.uk/exams.html