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

## www.papacambridge.com MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2011 question paper

## for the guidance of teachers

## 8682 FRENCH LANGUAGE

8682/31

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, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

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

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

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2011 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

		4347
Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' vers	on Syllabus to er
	GCE AS LEVEL – May/June 20	11 8682
		Cal.
Land	uage (out of 24)	Content (out of 16)

17.		
Language (out of 24)	Content (out of 16)	
21–24 Very good	Content (out of 16) 14–16 Very good Detailed, clearly relevant and well illustrated;	
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	
Generally sound grasp of grammar in spite of quite a few lapses; reads reasonably; some attempt at varied 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, ideas presented at random	