UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level and GCE Advanced Level

www.papacambridge.com MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2008 question paper

9716 FRENCH 8682 FRENCH LANGUAGE

9716/03 and 8682/03 Paper 3 (Essay), maximum raw mark 40

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began.

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

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2008 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level svllabuses.

		2.
Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus Syllabus
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2008	9716/8682

			Syllabus 9716/8682 levant and well illustrated; nd structured.
Page 2	Mark Schen		Syllabus of er
GCE A/AS LEVEL – Octobe		er/November 2008	9716/8682
Language (out of 24)		Content (out of 16)	171
21–24 Very good	1	14–16 Very good	
Confident use of complex sentence patterns, generally accurate, extensive vocabulary, good sense of idiom.		Detailed, clearly relevant and well illustrated; coherently argued and structured.	
16–20 Good		11–13 Good	
	grasp of grammar in spite of ses; reads reasonably; some vocabulary.	Sound knowledge and generally relevant; some ability to develop argument and draw conclusions.	
10–15 Adequate		7–10 Adequate	
A tendency to be simple, clumsy or laboured; some degree of accuracy; inappropriate use of idiom.		Some knowledge, but not always relevant; a more limited capacity to argue.	
5–9 Poor		3–6 Poor	
Consistently simple or pedestrian sentence patterns with persistent errors; limited vocabulary.		Some attempt at argument, tends to be sketchy or unspecific; little attempt to structure an argument; major misunderstanding of question.	
1–4 Very poor		1–2 Very poor	
Only the simplest sentence patterns, little evidence of grammatical awareness, very limited vocabulary.		Vague and general, i	ideas presented at random.