

FRENCH

Paper 7156/12
Listening

Question Number	Key
1	B
2	A
3	A
4	D
5	C
6	C
7	A
8	D

Question Number	Key
9	C
10	A
11	B
12	D
13	A
14	C

Question Number	Key
15	C
16	B
17	A
18	F
19	E

Question Number	Key
20	A
21	B
22	C
23	B
24	C
25	B
26	B
27	C
28	A

Question Number	Key
29	B
30	C
31	B
32	B
33	D
34	D

Question Number	Key
35	C/D
36	B/E
37	A/E

General comments

The November 2021 Listening paper consisted of 37 questions and was the first time the Listening test was multiple-choice for the November session. Candidates overall performed in a satisfactory way and most attempted all questions. Candidates should take care when they transfer their answers onto the answer sheet and shade **one** letter only for **Questions 1 to 34**, and **two** letters for **Questions 35 to 37**.

The French extracts heard by candidates gradually increased in terms of length and complexity and featured simple transactional exchanges, short monologues, conversations, and interviews. The emphasis of the questions moved from assessing the candidates' ability to identify information contained in short factual pieces to testing their ability to understand specific information, descriptions of events, opinions, emotions, and explanations in longer extracts. The paper differentiated well.

Comments on specific questions

Questions 1–8

The extracts were short, straightforward interactions. Overall, candidates performed well in this exercise.

For **Question 1**, some candidates did not know *vent*. Some candidates did not understand the time in **Question 3** and the price in **Question 5**. Candidates found **Question 6** the most challenging; nearly two thirds of candidates correctly chose option **C**, with option **B** (*deuxième rue à gauche*) being the most frequent error. Some candidates were not familiar with *douche* in **Question 7** and *aquarium* in **Question 8**.

Questions 9–14

Candidates heard a longer extract which featured a teacher talking to his students about a school trip to Guadeloupe.

Overall, candidates performed well in this exercise, particularly in **Question 12**. Over three quarters of the cohort answered the other questions successfully. For **Question 14**, some candidates were not familiar with *planche à voile* and the most frequent incorrect answers were **A** and **B**. There was no clear pattern of incorrect answers in the other questions.

Questions 15–19

This was a matching exercise in which candidates heard a conversation between two students about their friends. Overall candidates performed well in this exercise.

Over two thirds of the candidates answered **Question 15** correctly, selecting option **C**. **Question 16** was the most challenging. Over half the cohort chose the correct option **B**, matching *doit se reposer dans son lit* with *doit rester couché*; the most frequent incorrect answers were **C** and **D**. **Questions 17, 18 and 19** were answered well by candidates; there was no clear pattern of incorrect answers.

Questions 20–28

In this exercise, candidates heard an interview in two parts with Florian who lives in Quebec. The exercise represented a step up in the incline of difficulty of the test.

For **Question 20**, under half the candidates chose the correct option **A**, whilst an equal number chose distractor **C**. Candidates needed to listen carefully as *cuisine* referred to Florian, not to the neighbours as the distractor suggested. Similar numbers of candidates answered **Question 21** successfully. Those who answered incorrectly mostly chose distractor **C**. **Question 22** was the most challenging and few candidates understood that the photos referred to *les journaux*; most candidates incorrectly selected distractor **A**.

Question 23 was answered correctly by half the cohort. Most of those who answered incorrectly chose distractor **A**, missing the negative (*pas d'entrées*). For **Question 24**, just over a quarter of the cohort understood *la plupart de mes clients* and selected option **C**; the most frequent incorrect answer was distractor **B**, which only applied to **some** of the customers (*certains*).

Question 25 was attempted well. For **Question 26**, under a third of candidates chose the correct option **B**, with distractor **A** the most frequent incorrect answer. Similar numbers of candidates answered **Question 27** correctly. Many candidates chose distractor **A** as they heard Florian mention *les légumes de saison* and missed *mais surtout le fait que* which introduced the key. For **Question 28**, over a third of candidates matched *ravi* with *très content*; incorrect answers were equally split between options **B** and **C**.

Questions 29–34

Candidates heard an interview with Lilou, about family holidays. This was an appropriately demanding exercise at this stage of the paper.

Under half the candidates chose the correct option **B** for **Question 29**. Many heard *le chien* and chose distractor **A**. **Question 30** was successfully attempted by over half the cohort. Those who answered incorrectly usually chose distractor **A**, having missed *mon frère Jean n'est pas venu avec nous*. **Question 31** was challenging with just over a quarter of candidates choosing the correct option **B**; distractor **D** was the most frequent incorrect answer. **Question 32** was well attempted; some candidates did not hear *rapidement* and chose distractors **A** and **C**. For **Question 33**, under two thirds of candidates understood that Lilou was talking about day trips and chose option **D**; distractor **C** was the most frequent incorrect answer, candidates having missed the negative (*on ne va pas aller loin*). **Question 34** was the most challenging question in this exercise; few candidates understood that the children voted for their favourite activity. Most candidates chose distractors **A** and **B**.

Questions 35–37

Candidates heard an interview with Amir, a wedding planner. For each question in this exercise, candidates had to identify **two** correct statements from a choice of five. This was an appropriately demanding and challenging exercise at this stage of the paper.

Question 35 was the most challenging question. Few candidates correctly chose option **C**, but nearly half successfully chose option **D**. Many candidates chose distractors **A** and **B**. Candidates needed to listen carefully to Amir when he said *je n'ai pas commencé ma formation* and *j'ai été fleuriste comme mon père puis photographe*. For **Question 36**, many candidates correctly chose option **B** and almost a third selected option **E**. Candidates needed to listen carefully to understand that *couleurs* and *vêtements* referred to the wedding party, not to Amir as distractor **C** suggested. **Question 37** was well attempted with successful candidates choosing options **A** and **E**. Many did not understand *ce que j'ai le plus de mal à faire* and selected distractor **B**. Some candidates did not understand *le gâteau de mariage* and selected distractor **D**.

FRENCH

<p>Paper 7156/22 Reading</p>

Key messages

To maximise their chances of success on this paper, candidates should:

- only select the information from the text that answers the question (**Questions 4 and 6**)
- ensure that their response answers the question set
- remember that questions follow the order of the text.

General comments

Candidates appeared to have sufficient time to complete the paper, and almost all candidates were appropriately entered for the examination. There were few instances of candidates leaving more than a couple of questions blank.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Candidates performed very well on this question, but some candidates did not know *aspirateur* in **1(b)**.

Question 2

Full marks were common on this question. Option **G** was a common incorrect answer to **2(c)**.

Question 3

Candidates performed well on this question, but for **3(b)** and **3(d)**, option **A** was a common incorrect answer.

Question 4

For this exercise, candidates were required to read a more extended text in which Anne wrote about an enjoyable day she had spent with her friend, Lucie. The text was mostly straightforward, and the vocabulary covered familiar topics. Overall, candidates performed well on this exercise.

The text was written in the first person, and the questions used the third person. Most questions could be answered by lifting a small number of words from the text, but the answers to **Questions 4(f) and 4(k)** required a minor manipulation to gain the mark. If candidates chose to lift more than was required to answer the other questions, they had to make any manipulation needed in the extra material, usually involving going from the first to the third person. It is generally advised to answer with the minimum number of words.

Some candidates complicated their answers for **4(b)**, often finding the manipulation they needed as a result too difficult. For **4(d)**, candidates often confused what was available at the market with what Anne bought. For **4(e)**, reference to *pizza* often invalidated an answer, and some candidates thought that *une tranche de pizza* meant a pizzeria.

Some candidates thought it was necessary to paraphrase rather than lift from the text. There is no question on the paper where paraphrasing is needed and it is strongly advised that candidates do not do so, as they often use vocabulary that is not close enough in meaning to the actual word required.

Question 5

In this exercise, candidates had to match a series of descriptions with statements from five people looking for a *stage de vacances*. This exercise is aimed at the higher grades and the texts need to be read more closely in order to find the option that suits best.

Each person's statement gave quite specific requirements for the sort of holiday that they were looking for, and these details excluded all answers except the correct one. The statements included factors such as age and subject matter. Candidates need to ensure they consider all the information given as this is not a gist comprehension question.

Description **8** was a frequent incorrect answer for **5(e)**.

Question 6

This final exercise about travelling on a boat was intended to be the most challenging part of the paper. About half the questions can be answered with a careful lift from the text and the others need a small manipulation of the text to answer the question. Very few candidates achieved full marks, and the questions seem to have discriminated appropriately.

Although verbs do not necessarily have to be correct to score a mark, the tense usually must be appropriate to the question. Some candidates chose to paraphrase the text rather than lift words from the text. There is no need to do this, and although some candidates did this well, others used inappropriate synonyms when paraphrasing and could not gain the mark. For **6(i)**, some candidates attempted to find another word for *tristes* and answered with *déçus*, which has a different meaning.

6(a) was generally attempted well, but some candidates invalidated their answer by not lifting the text carefully enough. **6(b)** was often answered incorrectly with irrelevant details from the text. For **6(c)**, many candidates could not manipulate *ayant grandi* into *il a grandi*, and reference to *radio* often invalidated answers in **6(d)**. In **6(f)** and **6(h)**, some candidates added too much extra detail in their answer.

FRENCH

Paper 7156/03
Speaking

Key messages

- Centres had generally prepared candidates well for the new speaking test.
- Role plays were conducted well by most examiners.
- In the topics section, some centres need to make greater use of extension questions to elicit fuller answers from candidates. Sometimes, the topic conversations were very short.
- Most examiners understood the need to adhere **precisely** to the script in the Instructions for Teachers/Examiners and not to rephrase any questions.
- Most examiners also understood the need to ask **no more than two further questions** of their own if timings were short on topic conversations.
- Centres are reminded to use the alternative questions provided in the topic conversations if a candidate does not understand the first version (and repetition) of the question.
- The randomisation grid in the Instructions for Teachers/Examiners was usually followed correctly.
- Clerical work was usually very good in centres.
- The quality of recordings was usually very good.
- Centres are reminded to include candidates at the very top and the very bottom of the mark range in the sample.

General comments

The format of the test was new this year. The Speaking test is intended to be a test of spontaneous communicative ability. A wide range of performance was evident across the candidature and examples of performance at all levels of ability were heard.

Centres had usually prepared candidates well for the format of this new test and examiners were mostly aware of how to conduct the test efficiently and correctly. Examiners greeted candidates using the prompts provided and nearly all examiners read the scenario for the role plays as instructed in French. Most centres followed the instructions concerning the randomisation grid and understood the need to test candidates according to the prescribed order of the cards and conversation topics. Centres are reminded that the cards should be distributed according to the grid provided on pages 14–15 in the Instructions, with Card One given to the first candidate who takes the test and so on.

Role plays were generally conducted well. Centres are reminded that questions can be repeated (but not rephrased) once if the candidate does not answer a question or gives an ambiguous response. It is important for examiners to read the role play tasks exactly as printed to ensure that they are not changing the nature and level of difficulty of the tasks. It is useful to note that the role plays are not timed.

For the **topic conversations**, timings were not always appropriate. These were often too short and, in a few cases, too long. Some examiners needed to ask more **extension questions** (e.g. *Donne-moi plus de détails* or *Peux-tu me dire autre chose à ce sujet ?*) to give candidates the opportunity to develop their answers and go beyond brief or incomplete answers which do not communicate fully. Candidates need to understand the wordings of these extension questions so that they know when they need to give more detail. When asking extension questions, examiners can only use vocabulary provided in the printed question or vocabulary already used by the candidate. Examiners must not feed new vocabulary or ideas to the candidate.

If a candidate does not understand **Questions 3, 4 or 5** in the topic conversations (and a repetition of these questions), examiners must ask the **alternative question**. These alternative questions give candidates another opportunity to understand the task. Some examiners asked the alternative questions when the candidate had already answered the first question clearly, or used the alternative questions as extension questions. This should be avoided as it can be confusing for candidates.

When there was a PAUSE between two questions in the script, most examiners gave candidates the time to answer the first question before asking the second one.

Centres are reminded that if a topic conversation lasts 3½ minutes or less, even after asking extension questions, the examiner must ask **up to two further** questions of his/her choice on the **same** topic as the other questions to make sure that the conversation lasts 4 minutes. If the topic conversation still lasts 3½ minutes or less, the examiner must stop the conversation.

Examiners are reminded to introduce the topic area at the start of each topic conversation. This must be done in French.

Clerical checks and sample size

In most centres, the clerical work had usually been completed very efficiently and centres are thanked for this. It is essential that all clerical work is checked very carefully to ensure that candidates receive the correct mark. Centres generally understood the requirements of the sample size and samples were nearly always correct. In the very few cases when extra or replacement recordings were required, centres were quick to respond. Please always remember to include the work of candidates at the top and bottom of the mark range.

Recording quality

A high proportion of the recordings received were of a very good quality. Centres are thanked for this. Please check all recording equipment prior to the live exams and before despatching the sample. Please also try to ensure reasonably quiet conditions for recording to avoid background noise. The examiner, and **not** the candidate, must introduce the candidate by name and number. The recording for each candidate must be on a separate file and saved as .mp3. Each recorded file in the sample must be clearly named using the following convention: centre number_candidate number_syllabus number_component number. Recordings should be labelled correctly with the candidates' name and number on the box for the CD.

Application of the mark scheme

In the **role plays**, marks can only be awarded for the **set tasks**. To score 2 marks, an answer may be brief, but the language should be appropriate to the task, in an appropriate time frame, substantially accurate and not be ambiguous in terms of the message being communicated. If the meaning of the required message is made ambiguous through poor pronunciation of a key word, an incorrect time frame or an inappropriate form of a verb (if used), then a mark of 1 should be awarded. There were cases of 2 marks being awarded for answers which did not address the set tasks. In such cases, a mark of 0 was appropriate.

In the **topic conversations**, most centres awarded the marks for **Communication** consistently but a little generously. It was necessary to think carefully about how well the answers gave the **required information** and how consistently this could be done across the two topics. Performances where answers convey most of the required information but are brief, sometimes irrelevant and with little development, would fall into the Satisfactory category. To score high marks for Communication, candidates need to be able to offer **consistently** relevant information and to show that they can develop their ideas and opinions, adding relevant detail where necessary. The ability to justify and explain is also a feature of performance of the Very Good mark band. It should be noted that if conversations are short, candidates can be disadvantaged as they may not have the opportunity to develop their material.

In most centres, marks for **Quality of Language** also tended to be a little generous. The key descriptors considered here are the ability to use a range of structures as listed in the syllabus, and the ability to use a range of appropriate vocabulary. Pronunciation is also a key descriptor. To score high marks for Quality of Language, candidates need to show control of a **wide range** of accurately used language and structures and pronounce well. The ability to use appropriate time frames and correctly conjugated verbs is assessed here as part of the range of structures.

Comments on specific questions

Role plays

Examiners generally read the scenario as instructed. The nine role plays were accessible to candidates and set at an equal level of difficulty. They were all set in situations in which candidates could find themselves with a speaker of French and were transactional in nature. Contexts such as arranging outings with friends, obtaining goods or services and discussing travel details featured on the cards. Most candidates approached the role plays well with many scoring good marks. The weakest candidates also showed that they could score marks for partial communication on some tasks.

The first two tasks on each card were of a very factual nature and gave candidates the opportunity to answer briefly. They did not require longer and more developed answers. Candidates mostly answered these two opening questions well. It was essential for candidates to be familiar with questioning formulations such as *À quelle heure ? Combien ? Quand ? Où ? Quel ? Comment ?* Weaker candidates did not understand these and consequently gave irrelevant information which did not answer the set task. The last three tasks gave candidates more opportunity to develop responses. The vocabulary used in the role play questions was straightforward and usually notions of time and place were quite well understood.

On each card, the last three tasks were more challenging and gave candidates the opportunity to show that they could use past and future time frames correctly and develop their answers with opinions and simple explanations. A useful technique for candidates to adopt in the 10-minute preparation time is to think very carefully about useful vocabulary and structures which could occur in their given role play scenario. They should also think about the person with whom they are talking. Many candidates understood the key question *Pourquoi ?* and were usually able to give simple relevant reasons and opinions. In each role play, weaker candidates experienced some difficulty in answering in the time frame of the question and this made their responses ambiguous. The best responses heard were ones in which the time frame matched the time frame of the question as this meant the message was relevant and communicated unambiguously. Candidates also need to be aware that sometimes the form of register heard in questions is different according to the nature of the interaction and whether it is informal with a friend, or formal with a stranger when purchasing goods or obtaining services. On cards using the more formal *vous* form of address, candidates heard conjugations of verbs which they sometimes repeated inappropriately and did not conjugate the verb correctly in their answer, e.g. a question such as *Qu'est-ce que vous allez faire aujourd'hui ?* was sometimes answered as *j'allais/j'aller* which led to some ambiguity of time frame and prevented a mark of 2 from being scored.

Card 1 was accessible, and most tasks were approached well. On the third task, some candidates did not understand the need to respond with a type of film, although most were able to complete the task at least partially with an appropriate reason. Other tasks were generally done well.

On **Card 2**, most candidates were able to respond with an appropriate number in **Task 1** and day or date in **Task 3**, although the second part of **Task 3** was challenging for weaker candidates who had difficulty expressing a past time frame. In **Task 2**, some candidates could not give a type of room whilst others gave lots of unnecessary details about the room they wanted which sometimes led to ambiguity. **Tasks 4** and **5** were generally answered competently although the weaker candidates did not recognise the need for a future time frame in **Task 5**.

Card 3 was approached well, and most candidates were able to respond to **Task 1** with a number of days. On **Task 2**, some candidates did not understand the interrogative *comment* and were unable to reply with a means of transport. Other tasks were generally handled well although weaker candidates were not familiar with the vocabulary in the first part of **Task 5**: *mettre* and *sac à dos*. However, most were able to complete the second part of the task as *acheter* and *supermarché* were very familiar vocabulary items.

Most candidates made a good start to **Card 4** and were able to communicate a day and a time for going to the beach. Again, *comment* in the first part of **Task 3** proved to be a challenge for weaker candidates, although the association with the verb *voyager* was helpful for some. Some candidates found it difficult to answer the second part of **Task 3** in the past time frame. **Task 4** was not always understood, and many candidates listed items of food rather than saying what sort of restaurant they would like to eat in. **Task 5** was usually well done.

On **Card 5**, the first two questions were answered well. The past time frame in **Task 3** caused problems for weaker candidates but most candidates were able to give a train destination and complete at least part of the

task successfully. **Task 4** was usually well done. **Task 5** was not always understood with some confusion over the meaning of *notre région* and weaker candidates could not give a reason.

Card 6 was generally approached well with nearly all candidates able to say how many ice creams they wanted. *Parfum* in **Task 2** was not understood by some candidates, although this is a question that could have been anticipated from the role play scenario. **Task 3** was usually well done. A simple opinion and justification were enough for 2 marks to be awarded for this task. **Task 4** was usually successful although a few candidates could not pronounce *la Tour Eiffel* correctly. **Task 5** was less successful as some candidates did not seem to understand *pays* and others made errors of time frame which led to ambiguity.

On **Card 7**, most tasks were done well. The main challenge was expressing a preference correctly in **Task 5** with some candidates choosing *écouter de la musique chez toi* but not being able to make the correct grammatical change and repeating *chez toi*, thus leading to ambiguity. However, most were able to give an appropriate reason so were able to complete the second part of the task successfully.

On **Card 8**, most candidates began well, but some found it difficult to give a place to meet at the airport in **Task 2**. Any place that could feasibly be found in an airport was acceptable. Some candidates did not recognise the past time frame in **Task 3** and gave answers indicating what they were going to buy in France during their holiday rather than what they had bought in preparation for their stay. It is important for candidates to bear in mind the context of the role play given in the scenario. Most candidates were able to respond successfully to both parts of **Task 4**, and **Task 5** was also generally well done.

Candidates made a good start on **Card 9** and were able to suggest a time and a place for the cycle ride. Some candidates did not recognise the need for a past time frame in **Task 3** and this led to some ambiguous answers. Some candidates could not give a reason for liking cycling in **Task 4**, possibly due to a lack of relevant vocabulary. Most candidates were able to state their preference for a picnic by a river or in a forest for **Task 5**, but only stronger candidates were able to express a clear reason for their choice.

Topic conversations

Examiners are reminded to introduce the topic area in French just before the start of each conversation. The first three topics were based on one of the sub-topics of Areas A and B as listed in the syllabus. The last four topics were taken from one of the sub-topics in Areas C, D or E of the syllabus. All these sub-topics were familiar to candidates and a full range of performance was seen with each conversation having its easier and more challenging questions. The first two questions on each conversation were closed and straightforward in nature and were set at an easier level to start off the conversation. They could be answered briefly and with factual language, although stronger candidates took the opportunity to give more developed responses containing relevant details. The time frame used in the first two questions was the present. The final three questions on each card were more open and required candidates to communicate relevantly in past and future time frames. Each topic conversation also gave candidates the opportunity to express opinions and develop where possible their reasons for their opinions.

Topic 1, manger et boire, was a familiar topic for most candidates. In **Question 1**, some candidates did not understand the interrogative *où* and instead talked about what they have for breakfast, therefore giving an irrelevant response. **Question 2** was usually well answered with more able candidates taking the opportunity to add some extra details mentioning, for example, who they have dinner with or an alternative dinner time at the weekend. The introduction to **Question 3, parle-moi de**, and the past participle of the verb *prendre* proved challenging for some candidates and the use of the alternative question was required. Weaker candidates had some difficulty using the appropriate time frame here. **Question 4** was generally approached well, and most candidates were able to express an opinion of fast-food. Stronger candidates were able to develop answers about the health risks of fast-food and use a very good range of health-related vocabulary. **Question 5** was the most challenging question on this topic. Only the stronger candidates were able to mention a special occasion to celebrate in a restaurant and the alternative question was often used. However, most candidates were able to say who they would like to eat their special meal with, with most mentioning family and friends.

Topic 2, les amis, was accessible to candidates. The first two questions were generally answered well, although some candidates used the verb *être* to express age rather than *avoir* in their response to **Question 2**. Stronger candidates were able to add some relevant extra detail such as *il a le même âge que moi*, taking the opportunity to develop their answer and demonstrate the use of a comparative structure. Most candidates were able to respond to **Question 3**, although the alternative question was needed for weaker candidates. Answers here ranged from the simple (e.g. *elle est intelligente, il aime jouer au foot*) to the more sophisticated with the mention of qualities such as *loyauté, honnêteté et générosité* or more

complex expressions such as *il me fait rire* or *elle a les mêmes goûts que moi*. The first part of **Question 4** was generally approached well, and most candidates were able to give some factual information about what they did with their friend during a weekend in the past. The second part of the question was not always as successful, and some candidates could not express why they found the weekend enjoyable. **Question 5** was challenging for some candidates and there was often some repetition of vocabulary from **Question 4**.

Topic 3, le sport, was a very familiar topic for candidates. In **Question 1**, some candidates did not understand the interrogative *où* and instead talked about the sports they usually do, therefore giving an irrelevant response. **Question 2** was generally well answered with stronger candidates adding details about when they do sport at school and when they do it in their own time. Most candidates were able to give some relevant information in response to **Question 3**, but weaker candidates struggled to use and maintain the correct time frame. **Question 4** on the importance of sport for young people was mainly understood but the reason given was not always as successful. Many candidates were able to give a simple statement of the health benefits e.g. *c'est bon pour la santé*. Stronger candidates referred to the socialising aspect of sport, the spirit of friendly competition and the benefits of being part of a team. **Question 5** was usually approached well in a future time frame, but some candidates did not realise the significance of *autre(s)* or *nouveau(x)* and mentioned sports already referred to earlier in the conversation, leading to ambiguity.

Topic 4, le monde naturel et l'environnement, was accessible to candidates and most were able to say where they live in response to **Question 1**. In **Question 2**, either *temps* was misunderstood as meaning time or candidates were unable to use weather expressions correctly leading to ambiguity. On **Question 3**, some did not understand the significance of *une excursion récente* and the alternative question was often necessary. Most candidates could give some element of response to **Question 4** and the stronger candidates were able to show knowledge of a very good range of vocabulary to discuss environmental issues. **Question 5** was mainly understood, although weaker candidates lacked the necessary vocabulary to express their ideas on how they might contribute to the protection of the planet in the future.

Topic 5, l'environnement construit – les courses, was approached well by candidates but in **Question 1** some misunderstood *les courses* for *les cours* and began talking about lessons at school and this question often had to be repeated. **Question 2** was generally well answered. On **Question 3**, some candidates were unable to give a type of shop for which to express a preference and therefore the alternative question was sometimes needed. Stronger candidates were able to develop their ideas well on this question and talked about their interest in fashion, sportswear or gadgets. **Question 4** was generally approached well, and most candidates were able to give some details of a trip to a shopping centre, although the past time frame was a challenge for the weaker candidates. **Question 5** was usually understood by most candidates, but some did not have sufficient vocabulary to discuss the merits of choosing to shop in town or online in the future. Stronger candidates were able to mention the advantages of being able to see, touch and try on clothes in shops while others preferred the practicalities and rapidity of online shopping.

Topic 6, l'éducation, was a familiar topic and most candidates were able to answer **Question 1** and **Question 2** well. On **Question 3**, candidates needed to talk about what they did in their lunch break the day before and most were able to give relevant information, although weaker candidates had difficulty using and maintaining the past time frame leading to ambiguity at times. **Question 4** was the most challenging question on this topic. Some candidates did not understand the meaning of *règlements scolaires* and others did not have the necessary vocabulary to express their ideas clearly. Stronger candidates were able to discuss the merits of strict or relaxed school rules and their thoughts on wearing school uniform or their school's mobile phone policy, for example. **Question 5** was usually answered reasonably well with most candidates able to give some indication of their future plans in terms of education and reasons for their choice.

Topic 7, les pays, les nationalités et les langues, was generally approached well by candidates. Most candidates were able to express their nationality correctly in answer to **Question 1** and were also able to say what languages they speak for **Question 2**. **Question 3** was generally understood, although weaker candidates sometimes struggled to use and maintain the past time frame in their answer about their last holidays. In **Question 4**, some candidates found it difficult to say why it is interesting to visit other countries. Stronger candidates were able to discuss the merits of discovering other cultures, meeting new people and trying new food, for example. **Question 5** was not always understood, perhaps due to the unfamiliarity of *étranger*, and the alternative question was often needed. Once the question was understood, most candidates were able to respond with relevant information in the correct time frame as they were able to pick up *voudrais* + *infinitive* from the question.

FRENCH

Paper 7156/42
Writing

Key messages

Candidates are advised to:

- respond to all parts of **Question 2**
- focus on the tenses required in **Question 2**, past tenses are not expected
- use linking words in **Question 2**, for example when giving opinions/explanations
- choose the option in **Question 3** which allows them to show what they know
- expand on the basic details of their responses in **Question 3**
- plan and organise answers into a coherent piece of writing, using extended sentences where possible
- edit and review work carefully to avoid removing important information
- present all work legibly and not to write in ink over a draft in pencil.

General comments

Many candidates presented their answers in a coherent way. In the responses to both **Question 2** and **Question 3**, candidates organised their ideas, linking them appropriately with conjunctions (e.g. *cependant, donc, ensuite, et, mais, ou, pourtant*), subordinate clauses (e.g. *comme, où, quand, que, si*) and adverbial phrases (e.g. *d'abord, d'habitude, pendant, plus tard*). The mark scheme seeks to reward well organised pieces of writing. Some candidates responded to each of the tasks in the questions as if they were discrete items and, in such instances, the writing tended to be disjointed and lacking a coherent thread.

In both **Question 2** and **Question 3**, there were some common errors which might be described as phonetic e.g. *et* for *est*, *ce* for *c'est*, *s'est* for *c'est*, *sa* for *ça* and *ce* for *se*. Candidates must carefully check their work as such errors compromise the intended meaning.

Candidates are reminded to use the vocabulary and structures used in the rubrics and questions carefully. For example, the miscopying of nouns can interfere with the intended message. In **Question 2**, *ville* was confused with *vie* and *activités* was rendered as *activities*. In **Question 3(a)** *cuisine* was frequently written as *cusine* or *cousine*. It is important to remember that possessive adjectives such as *votre* (e.g. *votre correspondant, votre région*) must be changed to *mon* or *ma* (e.g. *mon correspondant, ma région*), otherwise the message is lost. Candidates must also remember to manipulate *vous voudriez* from the questions into *je voudrais* in their responses, as *je voudriez / j'aimeriez visiter* does not convey a clear message.

The individual tasks in **Question 3** give a clear indication of the tense to be used in the response: candidates should frame their responses accordingly if they wish to achieve high marks for *Task completion*. It is also important that candidates fully understand what is required by all the elements of the question. Some candidates chose **Question 3(b)**, but they did not have sufficient knowledge of the vocabulary required to write successfully about charity work.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1: Vous cherchez un hôtel sur Internet.

In **Task 1**, candidates were free to choose any country in which to stay. The French spelling was expected where such a version existed. Candidates were quite successful in giving a facility at the hotel for **Task 2**. There were many different ideas which reflected the range of possibilities in a hotel, e.g. *court de tennis, piscine, spa*, as well as the more obvious, e.g. *ascenseur, parking, restaurant*. The most common item for the bedroom in **Task 3** was *lit*, others included *balcon, douche, salle de bains, télévision*. In **Task 4**, there

were many suggestions for activities in the area, especially sporting ones, e.g. *natation, surf, tennis*. Candidates should aim to provide a single word to fill gaps, but phrases were rewarded here, e.g. *nager dans la mer, visite au château*.

Question 2: Ma ville préférée

Most candidates were able to use familiar language and structures when responding to **Question 2**. Candidates who worked methodically through the tasks in order were less likely to omit one of them.

In the best answers, candidates produced accurate verbs throughout their response. Weaker candidates relied upon infinitives or offered inappropriate tenses and spelling of verbs. Weaker candidates also struggled to respect gender agreements when using articles, nouns and adjectives.

Stronger candidates used a range of basic connectors (e.g. *et, ou, mais, parce que, puis*), whereas weaker candidates tended to rely on *et* and *parce que*.

Candidates did not always specify that they were describing their favourite town. Full consideration was given to those who referred to the place where they lived, as it seemed fair that their hometown would be the place they liked most.

Task 1 was attempted well and many candidates could give several details about their favourite city, e.g. *ma ville préférée est le Caire, c'est une ville historique ; malheureusement il y a du bruit et de la pollution*.

Task 2 was also managed well, and some candidates even combined it with **Task 3**, e.g. *généralement, j'y vais le week-end avec mes amis pour faire du shopping*.

In **Task 4**, candidates who succeeded in saying where else they would like to visit adapted the interrogative form, e.g. *je voudrais aller à Rome parce que je veux acheter des vêtements à la mode*. There was no requirement to name the place and answers such as *je voudrais aller dans une ville au bord de la mer car j'aime nager* or *je voudrais aller à la capitale pour voir les navires* were valid responses.

Question 3 (a): Un échange scolaire

This was the more popular option.

Task completion

All the bullet points must be answered in the correct tense/time frame and in the correct person, and appropriate opinions/reactions/explanations must be communicated where required by the task in order to gain full marks for *Task completion*. A mismatch between the subject and the verb will result in ambiguity and the message not being communicated clearly.

Not all candidates understood the context fully and wrote as if they were staying at the French school rather than with a correspondent.

In **Task 1**, candidates were required to use past tenses to convey information about their journey to their correspondent. Some made a simple reference to how they travelled, e.g. *je suis allé en France en avion*, others mentioned what they did during the journey, e.g. *j'ai bu un jus d'orange et j'ai mangé du poulet. Puis j'ai lu un journal*, and some made a comment about the journey, e.g. *le voyage était long et épuisant, il a duré six heures*. These were all acceptable answers. Some candidates offered lots of details for this task but were not able to sustain the control of verbs and tenses. They should have focused on one or two simple points rather than risk compromising their responses.

In **Task 2**, candidates managed to convey a lot of relevant information about how they spent the evening, e.g. *le soir, j'ai regardé un film d'aventure avec toute la famille, le soir de mon arrivée j'ai fait une promenade dans le parc avec mon correspondant*. Again, some candidates were not able to sustain the control of verbs and tenses.

Many candidates successfully conveyed at least one difference between their school and the school of their correspondent in **Task 3**. There was an opportunity here to use more complex language such as comparative adjectives/adverbs, e.g. *l'école de mon correspondant est plus petite que mon collège*. Some candidates also used the possessive pronoun successfully, e.g. *il n'y avait pas beaucoup de différences*

entre son collègue et le mien... Candidates were free to use either *mon école* or *mon collègue*, but it is important to remember that *école* is feminine and *collègue* is masculine.

In **Task 4**, most candidates were able to give an opinion about French food using simple patterns such as *j'aime la cuisine française parce que...* or *je n'aime pas la cuisine française parce que...* The reasons were sometimes detailed and well-expressed, e.g. *j'adore la cuisine française car c'est varié et appétissant, cependant c'est un peu cher.*

In **Task 5**, candidates did not always understand that they had to describe the activities they would organise when the correspondent came on a future visit to them.

Range

Some candidates were able to use the complex structures listed in the syllabus to add interest and variety to their accounts, notably comparative adjectives and adverbs, object pronouns and subordinate clauses.

To achieve high marks for *Range*, candidates need to use a wide range of structures and vocabulary, and avoid the repeated use of *car / parce que...*

Accuracy

The accuracy of spelling, gender, use of the appropriate article, placing and agreement of adjectives and elision are all critical, as is the correct choice of verb tense and form. Candidates need to spend time checking the accuracy of their essay. There were some frequent errors which had an impact on the critical messages. Verbs are critical to the effective passing of information. It is vital that candidates show their ability to manipulate verbs consistently in a variety of tenses and persons.

Question 3 (b): Bénévole pour une association caritative

Very few candidates chose this option.

Task completion

All the bullet points must be answered in the correct tense/time frame and in the correct person, and appropriate opinions/reactions/explanations must be communicated where required by the task in order to gain full marks for *Task completion*. A mismatch between the subject and the verb will result in ambiguity and the message not being communicated clearly.

Candidates who chose this question did not always have sufficient knowledge of the vocabulary required to write successfully about charity work. The few who were successful usually used simple statements in the appropriate tense.

There was a little confusion about the meaning of the final task. Candidates were asked to state what others thought of their involvement and only a few candidates were successful, e.g. *mes amis sont très fiers de moi.*

Range

Only a few candidates were able to use the complex structures listed in the syllabus to add interest and variety to their accounts, such as comparative adjectives and adverbs, object pronouns and subordinate clauses.

To achieve high marks for *Range*, candidates need to use a wide range of structures and vocabulary, and avoid the repeated use of *car / parce que...*

Accuracy

The accuracy of spelling, gender, use of the appropriate article, placing and agreement of adjectives and elision are all critical, as is the correct choice of verb tense and form. Candidates need to spend time checking the accuracy of their essay. There were some frequent errors which had an impact on the critical messages. Verbs are critical to the effective passing of information. It is vital that candidates show their ability to manipulate verbs consistently in a variety of tenses and persons.