



CONTENTS

FOREIGN LANGUAGE FRENCH	1
Paper 0520/01 Listening	1
Paper 0520/02 Reading and Directed Writing	3
Paper 0520/03 Speaking	5
Paper 0520/04 Continuous Writing	8

FOREWORD

This booklet contains reports written by Examiners on the work of candidates in certain papers. **Its contents are primarily for the information of the subject teachers concerned.**

FOREIGN LANGUAGE FRENCH

Paper 0520/01

Listening

General comments

Overall, the paper proved to be of a similar standard to last year's paper and Examiners were once again impressed by the overall standard of work produced by candidates in the examination. The paper produced a full spread of marks with a good proportion of the candidates scoring over half marks and displaying pleasing levels of competency in both specific and general comprehension tasks.

Most candidates were familiar with the requirements of the paper in terms of rubrics and had been well prepared in Centres. However, a small number continue to tick more or fewer than six boxes in **Section 2 Exercise 1**. It is well worth reminding candidates to read all instructions very carefully.

On questions requiring answers in French, the accuracy of the French was not taken into account unless the meaning was obscured. Answers in English were ignored.

Finally, candidates should be reminded not to use pencil when answering questions. They should use blue or black ink. Incorrect answers which are not to be marked by Examiners should be clearly crossed out by candidates. Where candidates change their mind about which box they wish to cross or tick, they should ensure that they indicate their final choice clearly to Examiners.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Exercise 1 Questions 1-8

This initial exercise tested the comprehension of short conversations. The question type used was multiple choice with visual options. **Question 1** was usually well answered, but on **Question 2**, candidates frequently mixed up right and left. **Questions 3-5** were generally answered correctly and the visuals were clearly understood by candidates. **Questions 6-8** were also fairly well answered, though weaker candidates did not always identify the right type of film for **Question 7**.

Exercise 2 Questions 9-16

Candidates generally performed competently on this exercise. They heard an account of a program on a school exchange visit and were required to indicate answers either by completing notes or by ticking boxes. Although **Question 9** was usually answered correctly, some wrote 7.46 instead of 7.45. In **Question 10**, *la mairie* was very poorly spelt by the majority of candidates and for **Question 13**, some candidates chose A rather than B.

Section 2**Exercise 1 Question 17**

Candidates heard four young people talking about the importance of languages in their lives and were required to tick six correct statements out of twelve options. Candidates generally approached this exercise well, but frequently chose option g instead of i. A few candidates ticked four boxes rather than six, thus denying themselves access to two of the available marks.

Exercise 2 Questions 18-26

This exercise featured an interview with a young actress talking about her work in a travelling theatre company. Answers had to be in French, but could be short provided that the message was clearly communicated. Incorrect spelling was tolerated if the correct concept was clearly expressed. Overall, the level of response was good, but weaker candidates found this a challenging exercise. On **Question 18**, many did not express the duration of time and often just answered *avril/septembre*. Others picked out just one of the months or invalidated their answers by separating the months with *et* or *ou*. Weaker candidates offered *elle est actrice*. **Questions 19** and **20** were generally answered successfully, though many had problems rendering *spectacle*. On **Question 21**, *sapeurs pompiers* was not well known by candidates. **Questions 22** and **23** were usually very well answered with many easily spotting *voitures* and the concept of *le bruit/l'animation*. **Question 24** was well answered – the concept of working together was understood – as was **Question 25**. **Question 26** proved to be more challenging. The best answers featured a reference to emailing or writing to the students in Tanghin.

Section 3**Exercise 1 Questions 27-32**

This final exercise featured an interview with a singer. The exercise type was multiple choice with verbal options and, as last year, candidates approached it well, often scoring at least 4 or 5 marks. No particular question proved to be more difficult than any other and no pattern of incorrect answers was discernible.

Exercise 2 Questions 33-41

This exercise was based on an interview with a French-speaking girl living in Australia and required candidates to provide short answers in French. As in **Exercise 2 of Section 2**, complete sentences did not have to be written and inaccurate French was tolerated provided that the message was clear. Most candidates managed to gain at least one or two marks, usually on **Questions 34** and **35**. **Question 33**, however, proved to be more difficult. It required candidates to convey the idea that the girl's mother was from Mauritius or that she had lived there in the past and, therefore, those who answered in the Present tense, implying that she lived there now, failed to gain the mark. Many candidates missed the reference to *ville stressée* or *gens stressés* and did not score the mark for **Question 36**. **Question 37**, which required some kind of comparison to be made between the two sisters, proved to be one of the more demanding questions on the paper. On **Question 38**, candidates found the comparison between French and Australian schools hard to express – in order to score the mark some reference to *mixte* and the fact that there were more mixed schools in France was required. On **Question 39**, *mode* was sometimes incorrectly rendered as *monde*, which invalidated the answer. **Question 40** required reference to the fact that the sport was typically Australian and candidates made good attempts at rendering this concept. As far as the final question was concerned, answers needed to include reference to travelling abroad: those which merely referred to future study did not gain the mark.

Notice to Centres

As a result of advances in technology and changes in the delivery medium for audio material it is becoming increasingly difficult for CIE to source the recording and production of audio cassette tapes for Listening examinations. We are therefore looking to change over from audio cassette tape to CD as soon as possible and in all likelihood by the May/June 2007 Examination session.

<p>Paper 0520/02 Reading and Directed Writing</p>

General comments

Overall, the standard of the paper was judged to be similar to last year. The general performance of the candidates was very good, especially in **Sections 1** and **2** where many candidates scored full or almost full marks. In **Section 3** the performance was much more varied with a complete spread of marks.

Most candidates attempted **Section 3** and gained marks in this section.

The majority of candidates had been thoroughly prepared for this examination: they were familiar with the test types and it was clear they had been trained to observe the rubrics, to read questions carefully and to complete all tasks.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Exercise 1 Questions 1-5

Questions 1, 2 and **3** were usually correctly answered. However, many candidates were unfamiliar with *bras* in **Question 4** (and therefore could not select the correct part of the body from the alternatives offered) and *repas* in **Question 5** (preventing them from selecting the correct activity from those offered).

Exercise 2 Questions 6-10

Question 6 was answered as *Vrai* by a large majority of candidates, which meant few achieved full marks on this exercise. The proposed outing was a cycle tour of the region, not a guided tour of the village, making *Faux* the correct answer.

Exercise 3 Questions 11-15

Generally, this exercise proved fairly accessible. However, problems with **Question 14** (candidates were unable to link *crabe* and *fruits de mer*) and **Question 15** (candidates were unable to link *Tarte aux Abricots* and *plats sucrés/dessert*) meant that full marks were rare.

Exercise 4 Question 16

Most candidates managed to convey the required points sufficiently clearly to score three marks for Communication. Expressing the time at which the film finished proved the biggest stumbling block for weaker candidates. A surprising number of candidates could not spell *supermarché* and a number of variations were accepted.

Section 2

Exercise 1 Questions 17-25

Candidates coped very well with this straightforward text: they seemed familiar with the vocabulary and were able to answer the questions correctly.

In **Questions 17** and **18** a few candidates had difficulties with the pronouns and simply reproduced the *me* and *moi* from the text, resulting in ambiguous answers. In **Question 21**, a brief answer such as *les voyages* was judged to convey the necessary information and awarded a mark. However, those candidates who simply copied out the phrase from the text – *nous faisons deux voyages chaque année* – were not rewarded as Examiners considered such answers to be confusing. In **Question 25**, *les devoirs* was sufficient to gain the mark. However, answers such as *il voudrait lui aider avec les devoirs* were judged ambiguous – it was not clear who was being helped – and could not score.

Exercise 2 Question 26

Candidates had clearly been prepared well for this writing task. They followed the rubric closely and took care to cover all three tasks. Pleasingly, Examiners reported very few over-long or extremely brief answers. Candidates found the topic (*Le temps libre*) accessible and as a result scores for Communication were high. In addition, a large majority had little difficulty achieving full marks for Accuracy. Centres should note that the spelling of *beaucoup* and *parce que* continues to cause problems.

Section 3

Exercise 1 Questions 27-32

On the whole, candidates understood the text about Stéphane, a travel writer/explorer, and coped well with the questions. A few candidates appeared to disregard (or maybe did not understand) the rubric and provided a 'corrected' version of a statement even when they had declared it to be *Vrai*. This did not affect their marks. Some candidates only attempted the *Vrai/Faux* element of the exercise, and were awarded the mark for correct answers, but made no attempt to correct the *Faux* statements.

Candidates were usually able to correctly identify **Question 28** as *Faux*, but when it came to providing a corrected version what they wrote was often not precise enough to gain the mark. The problems may have been at least partly due to poor understanding of the word *but* in the question. **Question 30** was often incorrectly thought to be *Vrai*. In fact, the text clearly states that Stéphane is sent to report on the Yanomani because he speaks fluent Portuguese (even though he had not travelled widely at the time). In **Question 32**, something along the lines of *il faut savoir faire beaucoup de choses* was sufficient to gain the mark. However, a few candidates simply lifted *Stéphane continue à apprendre: la mécanique, la photographie* from the text, which Examiners felt was not precise enough to gain the mark.

Exercise 2 Questions 33-40

On the whole, this final exercise was handled competently by candidates, most of whom understood the text about a school of dance in Brazil and the questions sufficiently well to be able to score at least half the available marks.

In **Question 36 (a)**, *danseuse* was sufficient to score the mark. Some candidates lifted the whole sentence – *Dora, née dans une famille assez riche, était alors danseuse étoile* – from the text and Examiners judged this as not demonstrating sufficient understanding. **Question 37** seemed to cause some confusion. Examiners were looking for something along the lines of *elle achète une école* but candidates sometimes gave *elle arrive à obtenir de l'argent d'une organisation charitable* which did not answer the question and could not score. In **Question 39**, *il y a 3.000 enfants à Edisca* was a fairly common answer, but could not be awarded the mark as 3000 was the number of candidates who had studied at Edisca since it opened, not the number currently studying there.

<p>Paper 0520/03 Speaking</p>

General comments

This paper was common to all candidates and, as in 2004, a wide range of performance was heard by Moderators.

Generally, the candidature displayed a very pleasing level of communication skills and the standard was in keeping with that heard last year.

Administration

It was disappointing to see an increase in the number of clerical errors. The following problems were encountered:

- Missing or incomplete MS1 (computer-printed) mark sheets. Some Centres recorded different marks on the MS1 mark sheets from those recorded on the working mark sheets. It is essential that all clerical work is completed with care and Centres are reminded that it is their responsibility to submit correct totals.
- Half marks. Some Centres insisted upon using half marks, but these do not feature in the mark scheme and should not feature anywhere on the mark sheets.
- Some Centres did not provide the name of the examining teacher in the space allowed for this purpose on the working mark sheet.
- Incorrect candidate numbers. Please ensure that candidate numbers are always written down correctly as sometimes these did not match up across the various pieces of paperwork submitted by the Centre.

Quality of recording

Most Centres had taken great care to ensure the audibility and clarity of the recorded sample although some persist in failing to position the microphone correctly. All recording equipment should be carefully checked prior to the first speaking test to ensure that it is working properly and that recordings are of a suitable quality. Also, the Examiner, not the candidate, should announce the candidate number. Once the recording has started, the tape should not be stopped until the end of a candidate's test. The recording of each candidate's test should last approximately 15 minutes. Some tests were very short, (see section on **Missing elements** below). Centres should also ensure that the cassette boxes are clearly and accurately labelled to show details of the candidates in the sample.

Missing elements

Each candidate must attempt two Role plays, (one A Role play and one B Role play), a Topic/Discussion section (approximately five minutes) and a General conversation section (also approximately five minutes). Moderators regret to report that, once again, there were Centres where a complete section of the Speaking test was omitted, but where marks were awarded for the missing element as if it had been completed. Marks cannot be awarded for sections of the test not undertaken by the candidate and in such cases Moderators had no choice but to reduce candidates' marks. It is essential that Examiners prepare for the Speaking test and feel confident as to the format of the test and the mark scheme so that they can help candidates to achieve their best possible performance. Examiners should also ensure that all candidates receive similar treatment in terms of timing.

Preparation of candidates

In the two conversation sections, Examiners should aim to engage candidates in a spontaneous conversation. Under no circumstances must candidates know in advance the questions they are to be asked in the examination. Where candidates are over-prepared, it becomes difficult for Moderators to find evidence of the ability to cope with unexpected questions and candidates are denied access to the top bands of the mark scheme. It was pleasing to hear the vast majority of Examiners engage in a spontaneous and natural conversation with their candidates, working with them and following up leads in the conversation wherever possible. Such Examiners used a good variety of questions with different candidates and pitched the level of questioning according to the strengths of the individual they were examining.

Application of the mark scheme

The mark scheme was generally well applied and marking was often close to the agreed standard. As a result, in many Centres no or only minor adjustments to the marks were needed. Where Centres required larger adjustments to their marks it was usually for one of the following reasons:

- Failure to complete all the Role play tasks.
- Short Topic/Discussion and General conversation sections.
- Lack of questions to elicit a variety of time frames in the conversation sections of the test.

Comments on specific questions

Role Plays A

Centres are reminded to encourage candidates to attempt all parts of each task. Marks can only be awarded for completion of the tasks set by CIE so it is vital that Examiners keep to the tasks specified in the Teacher's Notes booklet and on the Role play cards. Care should be taken not to change the wording of the Examiner's prompts in such a way as to take the task, and the possibility of working for the mark, away from the candidate. If only one part of a task is completed, only one mark can be awarded. Candidates should be reminded to look out for tasks which include the requirement to greet or thank.

As last year, the A Role plays were perceived to be of equal difficulty and a fair test at this level. They are designed to be easier than the B Role plays and are set using the vocabulary and topics from the Defined Content (Areas A, B and C). Generally, candidates found them accessible and even the weakest candidates were able to score at least one mark per task.

At the youth hostel

Candidates generally coped well with these tasks. Some candidates, however, could not say they had a reservation and instead asked to make a reservation.

An invitation to the cinema

Candidates approached this Role play well and nearly all were able to say what kind of film they wanted to see and make arrangements to meet. The last task, in which a preference needed to be stated for a kind of restaurant, was the least well done. Some candidates simply gave the name of a local restaurant in their own language and did not use French in their response.

In a clothes shop

Candidates approached the first three tasks well with even the weakest able to give details of what they wanted to buy. The most difficult task was Task 4 which required candidates to ask to try the item on or ask where the changing room was.

Role Plays B

Inviting a friend to stay

Candidates sometimes responded to an invitation rather than inviting their friend. Other tasks were attempted well and most were able to suggest how the trip could be financed.

At a police station

Candidates were generally able to say what they had lost and give their name and nationality, but they often failed to explain the reason for their stay in France. Quite a few candidates did not formulate a correct question on the last task, which required them to ask about opening times.

At a hotel

Candidates were able to outline the details of their room and attempted to explain the problems with it. On Task 4 some found it difficult to explain why they had not slept well and on Task 5 they sometimes forgot to thank the receptionist. Nearly all, however, were able to ask for a change of room.

Topic/Discussion

As in 2004, a wide range of topics was heard. It was pleasing to hear fewer examples of candidates choosing *Moi-meme* as a topic. This topic should be avoided as it can pre-empt the General conversation. A few Centres regrettably continue to present very short discussion sections. Centres are reminded that the candidate should be allowed to present their topic for one to two minutes and that the Examiner should then follow up with three to four minutes spontaneous conversation (the Topic/Discussion section of the test should last about five minutes in total). The discussion that follows the presentation of the topic should be spontaneous in nature: the candidate must not be aware of the questions they will be asked. Examiners should ensure that they ask questions that will elicit both past and future time frames from the candidates.

Holidays, Free Time, Family, Festivals and School were popular and appropriate topics. As last year, a wide range of performance was heard, from very simple to very fluent expositions. Skilful questioning by Examiners meant that most candidates were given good opportunities to perform at a level appropriate to their ability. The majority of Examiners are to be applauded for the way in which they avoided closed questions, which could only elicit yes/no responses. It was evident that an open style of questioning, for instance *Parle-moi de...*, elicited the best responses from candidates. It was particularly pleasing to hear candidates attempting to give and justify their opinions. Centres are reminded that it is good practice to tell candidates when this section of the test is over and when they are moving on to the General conversation. Moderators also find this helpful.

General Conversation

As in the Topic/Discussion section, a wide range of performance was heard. The role of the Examiner in helping the candidate to work for the marks can never be underestimated and many Moderators commented on the professionalism shown by Examiners in this section of the test. The most successful Examiners ensured good coverage of topics (at least two or three), allowed a pleasing, natural conversation to develop and afforded candidates the opportunity to work in different time frames, which is crucial for a mark of seven or more on Scale (b) of the mark scheme. The best performances by candidates featured a variety of tenses and a good range of vocabulary and structures. It remains a pleasure for Moderators to hear this international candidature talking about a huge variety of lifestyles and experiences.

Paper 0520/04
Continuous Writing

General comments

It was pleasing to note the enthusiasm with which most candidates tackled this paper. Much of the work was lively and original and the majority disciplined themselves to keep to the point of the questions and to follow closely the demands of the rubric. There was only occasional incidence of evasiveness or padding. However, many candidates did lose marks unnecessarily for overlooking specific tasks set out in the questions.

Most candidates wrote approximately the recommended 140 words and few offered less than 100. The tendency to write excessively long pieces is declining, but candidates from a small number of Centres do persist in writing far too much and in so doing deny themselves access to some of the marks. Examiners reward only what is contained in the first 140 words.

Examiners were impressed by the high quality of French presented by the best candidates. Their use of language was fluent and idiomatic with only a minimal incidence of error. This year there was a marked tendency for marks to be higher on **Question 1** than on **Question 2**. In the first question the natural tense was the Present and the tasks were fairly familiar (home and friends). Only the best were able to display in **Question 2** the full range of appropriate past tenses including Perfect, Imperfect and Pluperfect, while sustaining an interesting and original narrative. Ambition in the use of disjunctive and object pronouns, present participles and infinitive and negative constructions was to be applauded. Furthermore, Examiners are always pleased to reward a rich and varied range of vocabulary and idiom.

Less successful candidates were frequently guilty of haste and carelessness. Centres should advise their candidates that the time allowed is normally ample to complete both questions and to compose each sentence with care. There should be time to spare to check for careless errors and inconsistencies. It was particularly noticeable this year how often common words such as *beaucoup* were spelled in a variety of ways on the same script and how frequently the gender of the narrator varied from feminine to masculine. Individual words given on the question paper were commonly misspelled, notably *avantages* rendered as 'advantages' in **Question 1 (b)**. Candidates should be advised not to rely too much on exploiting the rubric, as sections lifted and copied *en bloc* from the question paper do not receive any credit. This practice was especially evident in **Question 2**.

The standard of presentation of a number of scripts left much to be desired. Examiners cannot give credit for work they cannot read.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) *Mon meilleur ami/Ma meilleure amie*

This was a popular choice, especially with girls, more of whom were perhaps attracted by the personal nature of the question.

Many interesting pieces were received and a close friend was evidently regarded as indispensable. Candidates expressed a fondness for their friend and usually found plenty to say about his/her character and the activities they enjoyed together. Cases of misunderstanding of the rubric were rare.

The first task was well done. Nearly all were able to offer a physical and/or personal description of the friend, including usually the colour of hair and eyes, complexion, height and figure. Almost all were good looking. One imagines this is familiar ground for many, but potential marks were frequently lost due to a failure to make adjectives agree appropriately. It proved harder to say why they got on well with the friend. Better candidates were able to say they were of similar temperament or had similar interests. The less able did not always understand *s'entendre*. Describing shared activities was more straightforward. Girls usually enjoyed just being with their best friend, going to town together, shopping, dancing, going to church or just talking. Boys preferred playing games or other lively pursuits. Examiners were generous in the interpretation of *différences*. Some candidates said the friend was tall, but they were short. Others said that the friend was shy, but they were sociable or vice versa. Most settled for a difference of interests – she likes sport, but I prefer music or he plays football, but I like rugby. None of these differences were detrimental to their friendship, in fact they were thought to enhance it. In the last task (*Pourquoi votre ami(e) vous est important(e)?*), Communication marks could be obtained by simply saying *Il m'aide beaucoup* or *Elle est toujours là pour moi*, but the more ambitious were able to elaborate on this, exploring the nature of friendship, exchanging secrets, sharing ups and downs, giving and taking advice, comfort and companionship.

The topic of friendship was clearly relevant and important to almost all who attempted this question and this personal interest enhanced the quality of answers received. As the tasks could be completed by using only the Present tense and the subject matter was familiar, requiring mainly every day words, many candidates were able to score quite highly both for communicating ideas and for Language.

(b) *Où préférez-vous vivre?*

The demands of the question and the quality of the answers received were very similar to those of alternative (a). Candidates again found themselves on familiar ground and were usually able to write coherently about their own home surroundings and the benefits or disadvantages of living there. As with (a), the Present tense was appropriate throughout and the subject matter was accessible, so scoring was quite high both for Communication and for Language. Few candidates failed to understand the rubric.

In the first task the description of *où vous habitez* was usually taken to be the town or region in which the candidates lived, but descriptions of the candidates' house were also allowed. Answers referred to the size of their home town or village, its beauty or lack of it, the proximity of the sea or the mountains, facilities such as shops and entertainment venues and whether the people were nice or not.

Descriptions tended to be fairly brief and in some cases regrettably omitted one of the tasks, incurring the loss of a Communication mark. More detail was included in listing the pros and cons of city life against country life or living abroad. Town dwellers usually alluded to the availability of leisure facilities as the first advantage, citing swimming pools, sports facilities, cinemas, a variety of shops, clubs and, perhaps surprisingly, restaurants. Then there was the convenience factor. They lived near school, family and friends and the town centre and there was public transport, although this was not always reliable or recommended. The most commonly mentioned disadvantages were pollution (rife apparently throughout the world), traffic, noise, crime and overcrowding. In contrast country dwellers enjoyed the beauty of the scenery, nature, clean air, and tranquillity. However, they did not relish the inconvenience of living so far from friends and family or having long journeys to school. On the whole they found country life uneventful for the young.

Most were able to say *si j'avais le choix je voudrais habiter...* and state where they would like to live, giving reasons. Temperament seemed to determine the choice of many, the lively preferring to opt for the busy social world in town while the self confessed shy ones preferred the country. While most cited the qualities of the town or the country which attracted them, others gave negative reasons. The town was too dirty or noisy. The country was too dull and boring or inconvenient. Many just wanted to live near their family so were reluctant to move anywhere. Only a minority would choose to live abroad, in fact few even referred to the idea. Those who did often chose France because of all the good prospects or just to see the Eiffel Tower.

A criticism which could be made of a number of candidates was that certain phrases were repeated many times. The over-use of *il est, c'est, j'aime* and especially *il y a* even on above average scripts depressed marks, as Examiners reflected such a lack of variety by awarding reduced discretionary marks for General impression.

Question 2

The stimulus was almost invariably well understood, but candidates should be reminded to follow instructions carefully. The rubric indicated that they should continue the story from the end of the stimulus, *Continuez l'histoire*, therefore no credit was given for the communication of events occurring before the narrator reached the house. In addition, no credit was given for Language or Communication for copying out all or part of the stimulus from the question paper.

As stated above, it was particularly noticeable this year that many candidates who had scored quite well in **Question 1** were unable to maintain the quality of their French when faced with the challenge of devising an original narrative in past tenses. Deprived of the props of familiar phrases (*j'aime, je voudrais, il y a, je préfère* etc.) appropriate to **Question 1** and of the specific nature of the set tasks, they struggled to invent a plausible sequence of events expressed in coherent language. Weaker candidates tended to make it up as they went along and stories became very complicated or improbable. They would enter the house (one wondered how as there was nobody there to let them in) encounter strange animals or people, dreadful accidents occurred and they ended by introducing at the last a surprise party which was perhaps half remembered from a previous essay. Such candidates often attempted to express ambitious ideas which were beyond the compass of their French.

Better candidates managed to imagine themselves in the situation and to ask themselves what they would actually do. The first thing was usually to try to phone the friend. It is pleasing that many do now know *téléphoner à*. Having usually failed to make contact, some sensibly asked a neighbour for help. The more able were comfortable with reported speech (*Je lui ai demandé si..., Il m'a dit que...*) with appropriate tenses. Others at this point were unable to produce a Pluperfect to say what the friend or his/her family had done. Some quite logically found a note saying the family had gone away, the Pluperfect again proving to be elusive. The simplest explanations and solutions were usually the best and the easiest to express. The family had left on important business, the narrator should let himself in, rest, get something to eat and watch TV. Finally the family returned and all enjoyed a meal together. Key to relating this sequence of events was the ability to handle in the Perfect tense the verbs of motion, *aller, entrer, descendre, partir, rentrer*, etc. and common reflexives such as *se reposer, se coucher* and *s'asseoir*. This task proved beyond large numbers of candidates who failed to use the auxiliary *être* and often failed to make necessary past participle agreements.

Candidates should be reminded always to pay close attention to the rubric. They were instructed to say what the narrator did (*ce que vous avez fait*) so no Communication marks were available for what the neighbour or the friend did, although of course that could score marks for Language. The rubric also required candidates to say how they reacted to the situation. This could take the form of a simple statement that they were shocked or surprised, disappointed or afraid, then later happy or relieved. Unfortunately, many omitted to include any reactions of this kind, thus denying themselves access to some of the available marks. It was again quite common to find feminine and plural agreements missed on adjectives and past participles. Also many were unable to offer an Imperfect tense to convey a description in the past.

More than in past years Examiners observed an incidence of candidates using mistaken verbs. It was disappointing to find so frequently at this level the use of: *entendre* for *attendre*, *écouter* for *entendre*, *regarder* for *voir*, *chercher* for *trouver*, *retourner* for *revenir*, *rester* for *se reposer*, *savoir* for *connaître* (and *vice versa*), *essayer* for *s'asseoir* and *parler* for *dire*. A very common lexical slip was the use of *joli* for 'happy'.