

# CONTENTS

---

<b>ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE .....</b>	<b>2</b>
Papers 0510/01 and 0510/02 Reading and Writing .....	2
Paper 0510/03 Listening .....	6
Paper 0510/04 Listening .....	7
Paper 0510/05 Oral Communication .....	9
Paper 0510/06 Coursework.....	11

# ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

---

Papers 0510/01 and 0510/02  
Reading and Writing

## General comments

Candidates for both Papers seemed to have been entered at the correct tier, apart from those at a very small number of Centres where some candidates may have been better served by doing the Extended rather than Core Paper. The Paper seemed to interest the candidates and many were able to show their abilities to the full.

Few sections were omitted and most candidates showed good use of their time. Where candidates did miss out any sections these were usually **Part 2 Exercise 2** the summary, or one of the three writing exercises in **Part 3**.

In the reading sections, weak candidates did not read for meaning, often copying out chunks of information indiscriminately. They did not always focus on the question which was set. There is some evidence this session that many candidates are not reading the questions in full which may account for this. On the other hand more able candidates did focus correctly and often wrote eloquently and accurately.

Many candidates did well in **Part 3** supplying plenty of detail and ideas especially in the School Trip and Space Travel exercises.

Handwriting and presentation are improving although there are still a significant number of candidates whose handwriting is very difficult to decipher and who place considerable burdens upon the Examiners.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Part 1**

#### **Exercise 1**

- (a) This question was usually answered well in both Papers. Some lifted the whole sentence, 'eight storeys high and over 30m wide', but still attracted a mark. Some candidates mistakenly gave the answer '30m wide'.
- (b) This question was a little difficult for some candidates who gave the answer 'largest film frame', but the majority found no problems with this question.
- (c) Very many gave the wrong answer - that it could be seen from the moon - this may be a result of candidates not reading and focusing on the question sufficiently. Sometimes candidates confused the answers to (b) and (c).
- (d) This was usually well answered. The word 'sound' in the rubric helped the 01 candidates to locate the correct answer and the remainder were able to find the two details noted on the Mark Scheme. A few candidates were lulled into writing about the six channel digital sound without any focus on the question.
- (e) This was well answered in the main. The only difficulties were where candidates had written 'thrilling flight' without further detail or explanation.

## Exercise 2

*(Core Paper 01 only)*

Candidates engaged well with the subject matter.

- (a) There were few problems with this question and most candidates got the correct answer.
- (b) Sometimes the word 'screen' was missing from the answer and occasionally the word 'number' appeared in place of the correct answer 'computer screen'.
- (c) Invariably most candidates opted for the description of what happens as a consequence of the 'magic number 7 effect', quoting the rest of the sentence containing the phrase rather than referring to the statement of what the effect actually was in the previous paragraph.
- (d) There was general accuracy here. Only one or two weaker candidates answered with ninety percent.
- (e) Most candidates did this question correctly and without difficulty; some opted for a 'scattergun' approach though.

## Exercise 2

*(Extended Paper 02 only)*

This whole exercise was very well done by the majority of candidates.

- (a) Very often correct, although some failed to score wrongly lifted the first sentence in the stimulus or by not emphasising the number of twins, 13, or 'a lot of'.
- (b) Some answers showed confusion about the brothers and mentioned the newspaper or the goals scored by one of the twins.
- (c) Well done in the main. 'Physically different' and 'different personalities' were the two most common answers. There were hardly any answers from 'they might not like/get on with each other'.
- (d) Usually well answered in spite of lifting from the text.
- (e) If marks were lost it was because candidates did not include the idea of 'better' treatment. Some wrote about the idea of organs being underdeveloped and did not score any marks.

## Exercise 3

- (a) Quite a few candidates gave the daily amount of time 6 - 8 hours. This was an example of candidates not reading the question thoroughly. However, able candidates answered concisely and correctly.
- (b) Many candidates misunderstood the meaning of this question answering 'constructed by the Incas' without including the essential fact that the construction of this track was to make the ascent easier. Some candidates misunderstood the idea of a 'trek' or wrote that the trek had been planned by the Incas themselves.
- (c) This was usually well answered with candidates lifting correctly from the text. Some answered the question 'how' without answering 'why' and therefore failed to gain the mark.
- (d) Quite a few correct answers often nestled within a fairly lengthy lift from the stimulus. Incomplete answers included the idea of leaving the horses behind but this was not accurate enough for the mark.
- (e) Unfortunately many 'glaciers and icefields' were included here. Candidates had failed to realise that the question referred to the things that could be seen on the descent. Once again an incomplete reading and understanding of the question sometimes denied candidates a mark here.
- (f) Most got the idea of the 'magic and mystery' or the 'splendour', but a few candidates merely stated that they would arrive in Machu Picchu. This did not answer the question fully.

## Part 2

### Exercise 1

- (a) Hardly any candidates gained the full two marks here. Only the most able were able to distinguish between this question and **Question (f)**. Many Core tier candidates had real difficulties with this question as a number of them quoted 'team work' or 'collaboration' rather than dealing with the real importance for ICT in its recruitment of more women workers - these reasons being stated near the beginning of the text.
- (b) This was usually correct and candidates had interpreted the diagram well.
- (c) Often, the whole sentence which included the word 'negative' or 'negativity' was given, but that still gained the mark.
- (d) Many failed to grasp the idea of 'inspiration'. Confusion here often denied marks to candidates.
- (e) A range of responses was seen, with a number of candidates quoting 'pressing buttons is not enough' which was rather incomplete.

*(Extended Paper only)*

- (f) Most candidates gained marks in this question. If they managed the first point about working in teams then the others usually followed. Often the idea of 'personal' skills was missing but usually the rest of the answers were acceptable.

### Exercise 2

The summary question is always a challenge for candidates and this session was no exception. About a third of candidates wrote well over the word length. Candidates must be reminded that this is a summary and the word length is deliberately set so that their summary writing skills can be tested. Exceeding the maximum word length significantly is not a good strategy to adopt and high marks can never be gained in this fashion. Often, content points cannot be credited if they are included beyond the word length and the language mark cannot be high in these circumstances.

The majority of the candidates grasped the key points and the fact that the passage had a historical theme to it. Many candidates managed to score three or four content points if they wrote to the word length, although there were not many candidates who were sufficiently fluent to attain three or four language marks and few were able to use their own words.

Those who did not do well in this exercise sidetracked themselves into including the irrelevant details of the pigeons' performance or concerns for their future. Some were confused between 'p-mail' and e-mail and a very small minority (mainly Core candidates) wrote completely off the track about the animal rights issues involved in using these birds for sending messages.

### Exercise 3

*Form filling (Core Paper 01 only)*

This was generally satisfactory, although some candidates found some sections particularly challenging.

Many did not read the requirement for capitals.

Most gave the name of the school correctly but a few candidates wrote 'in Jordan' for the address which was not accepted. The e-mail address was usually correct and upper or lower case was accepted here without prejudicing the mark for capitals, if relevant. However, the club name was frequently incorrect or mixed up with the Coach's Name. Many got the spelling of this correct. Only a few candidates got the correct name and spelling for the Organiser and quite a few thought that 'Cycling World' was the correct answer here. Some candidates mistook Mr Whinn for the Organiser too. The number in the party was usually correct and the 'time of the visit' was usually circled. Candidates took note of the instruction to tick only two boxes in 'Areas of Interest' and were often correct. However, hardly any candidates filled in anything for the final section or wrongly put something about nutrition or increasing their energy.

### Exercise 3

*Note making (Extended Paper 02 only)*

This was generally satisfactorily done. If the first two answers were incorrect it was usually because the candidate had concentrated on the second paragraph and wrote about the food and drink; this did not answer the question.

In the section headed 'Creating the Ice Sculpture', many candidates gave all the processes on one line, only scoring one mark. A few said that the sculptures themselves should be kept warm! However, many realised that the lift about having no time to stop for breaks was a valid point here.

Almost all candidates got the answers correct in the final section gaining two marks.

### Part 3

Candidates showed real evidence of engagement with the tasks at Core and Extended levels and produced some interesting and occasionally genuinely moving pieces of writing, especially in **Exercise 1**.

But in this section there were some problems with word length, especially on the Extended Paper in **Exercise 2**. The requirement here is for candidates to write about 200 words. Many candidates wrote well below this word length and sacrificed marks because of it. Centres should once again remind candidates to read the questions carefully so that these mistakes are not made in the future.

Also, it is not necessary for candidates to 'fill out' the word length by providing an address even though the question may ask for a letter. It has been a convention in previous sessions that these addresses given by candidates were ignored, however so many candidates gave addresses in **Exercise 2** that Examiners did include them in the overall word length for this session. The marks are given for the content from the candidate and usually this does not include an address.

### Exercise 1

There were many delightful, and often moving, pieces of writing in this exercise with candidates often recommending their best friend or someone who had gone through difficulties and triumphed. This was often accompanied by a sophisticated and accurate use of language such as 'not only one of the best students...she is also an amazing friend' and 'never have I met such...'

Some of the things written about included the type of friend one would 'cross rivers or climb mountains and walk deserts to find'; hard work achieved in spite of being academically challenged or having been a bad student in the past; saving someone from drowning; preventing horses from being mistreated; helping the needy or just spending time with others to help 'pull up grades'.

Difficulties noted by Examiners included problems with verb subject agreement, the use of 'price' for 'prize', and not addressing all the bullet points.

But in the main these answers were very enjoyable to read.

### Exercise 2

On the whole the exercise seemed to encourage the candidates to 'open out' more with regard to vocabulary and style. In better answers the tone and register were often very good. The prompts were adhered to although occasionally the last prompt was omitted or hastily and briefly added as an afterthought. Many included interesting details of the trip and were at pains to reassure parents of the safety and relevance to school work. Their reasons were varied including geography or biology field trips, careers fairs or simply to know more about or enjoy their own countries.

Some candidates again did not read the question carefully and did not write a letter to all parents but addressed their own family instead, thus beginning and ending with inappropriate opening sentences and conclusions. Some answers were too short.

### Exercise 3

Better answers gave good discursive responses without too much reliance on the prompts. They seemed to have been well prepared both in terms of argument and vocabulary and there were some mature and convincing arguments.

However, a large majority of answers were relatively unambitious in spite of using an appropriate register for a school magazine. Many candidates relied far too much on the prompts, lifting them to fill significant parts of their essay.

Not many candidates wrote in favour of Space Travel, seeing it as a waste of time and money which could have been spent on more worthwhile things such as homelessness, education, and AIDS.

Some candidates, as always, were let down by the wrong use of prepositions, wrong tenses, verb subject agreement problems, and poor punctuation and sentence structure.

Paper 0510/03

Listening

### General comments

Candidates seem to have been prepared well for the component, and most coped confidently with its format and challenge. The progression of the questions and the subject matter presented was handled efficiently by most candidates, and Examiners were pleased with the performance in general.

As in previous sessions, spelling was not taken into account in accordance with the listening for - understanding ethos of the component and so phonetic attempts at the answer could be rewarded unless this made a difference in meaning. General spelling was weak, though, and where it undermined communication of the answer a mark could not be awarded.

Examiners also reported that many gaps were left. It is always a good strategy to have an attempt at the answer especially if it makes contextual sense. In general, though, the timeframe of the component was well handled by candidates.

### Comments on specific questions

#### **Part 1**

Generally candidates responded well to this section of the Paper.

**Question 1** was well answered with most candidates engaging with the idea of '12 minutes' correctly.

**Question 2** was also usually correctly answered: '5 cups of coffee'.

**Question 3:** There were some weak responses here. The idea of 'leave before 10' and 'come back before 5' was ably noted by some candidates, but some used different numbers and did not seem to understand the verbs or the terms of the ticket in the question. Prepositions were often used incorrectly here.

**Question 4:** The three 'working days' was generally well answered although there were some mistakes on the currency - dollars - and the amount, 3.80. Some candidates confused the numbers or omitted any form of currency.

**Question 5** was well done generally - the mark scheme allowed 36 or 36-plus-driver or 37, but not '37 pupils' as some candidates wrote.

**Question 6** was generally well answered although some candidates answered 'when' rather than 'why'. Often 'engine' became 'agent' and could not be credited.

There was evidence of good aural comprehension and engagement with subject matter in this section. Further work on question words such as 'why', 'when' and 'what' would help to boost marks here.

**Part 2**

This part of the Paper comprised two note-taking exercises. **Question 7** with five available marks, concerned a new dinosaur museum, 'Dinosaur Island'. The first mark was awarded for recognising that the building looked like a dinosaur - some candidates negated the answer here by writing 'shades of dinosaur'. The footprints for the second mark became 'footprint' often and many candidates did not include the length of time or misconstrued the numbers or changed the 'million' to 'billion.' As always, those who wrote in longhand here managed to score well. Further work on numbers and quantities and time lengths is to be recommended. 'Opening times' was generally correctly inserted but the final mark for the web address often led to mistakes - spelling was poor here even though 'dinosaur island' was already printed on the Paper.

**Question 8** was in response to an interview with a sports photographer and carried seven marks. The age of the photographer (43) here was often incorrect with '34' or '25' being offered by candidates. The next question was sometimes perfectly answered but on occasions candidates lost the mark. The idea of the father giving the child a camera was needed in order to score here. The two sports - tennis and windsurfing - were generally correctly answered, but the idea of the 'mast' in the next question gave rise to many attempts of 'mask'. The book title and the ISBN number were well tackled overall.

**Part 3**

**Question 9** concerned disappearing forests and was well answered except for **(d)** and **(h)**; the forests did indeed 'counter soil erosion'.

**Question 10** concerned the work of a sculptor and was well handled. Candidates scored well here - with **(e)** the wood could not be used dry **(j)** she liked to show others how to carry out her craft and **(c)** she began by making things from driftwood being the exceptions. Apart from these few problems candidates engaged well with these tasks and taped texts and showed evidence of good aural comprehension.

<p><b>Paper 0510/04</b> <b>Listening</b></p>
--

**General comments**

Candidates seem to have been prepared well for the component, and most coped confidently with its format and challenge. The progression of the questions and the subject matter presented was handled efficiently by most candidates, and Examiners were pleased with the performance in general.

As in previous sessions, spelling was not taken into account in accordance with the listening for - understanding ethos of the component and so phonetic attempts at the answer could be rewarded unless this made a difference in meaning. General spelling was weak, though, and where it undermined communication of the answer a mark could not be awarded.

Examiners also reported that many gaps were left. It is always a good strategy to have an attempt at the answer especially if it makes contextual sense. In general, though, the timeframe of the component was well handled by candidates.

**Comments on specific questions****Part 1**

Part 1 of the examination was the short question and answer section comprising six short scenarios demanding good focus and precise answers. Generally candidates responded well to this section of the Paper.

In **Question 1**, the 3 'working days' was generally well answered, although there were some mistakes on the currency - dollars - and the amount, 3.80. Some candidates confused the numbers or omitted any form of currency.

**Question 2** was well done generally - the mark scheme allowed 36 or 36-plus-driver or 37, but not '37 pupils' as some candidates wrote.

**Question 3** was generally well answered, although some candidates answered 'when' rather than 'why'. Often 'engine' became 'agent' and could not be credited.

**Question 4** was generally well answered, '15 minutes' being understood by most candidates. A small number wrote '502' here and failed to score.

**Question 5** The idea of there not being enough transport was needed for the first mark and then the idea of Gabor's father helping for the second mark. This proved quite challenging for many.

**Question 6** seemed more accessible, but unfortunately many omitted any weight at all and some put 'km' for 'kg'.

There was evidence of good aural comprehension and engagement with subject matter in this section. Further work on question words such as 'why', 'when' and 'what' would help to boost marks here.

## **Part 2**

**Part 2** of the Paper comprised two note-taking exercises. **Question 7** with seven available marks, concerned a new dinosaur museum, 'Dinosaur Island'. The first mark was awarded for recognising that the building looked like a dinosaur - some candidates negated the answer here by writing 'shades of dinosaur'. The footprints for the second mark became 'footprint' often, and many candidates did not include the length of time or misconstrued the numbers or changed the 'million' to 'billion'. As always, those who wrote in longhand here managed to score well. Further work on numbers and quantities and time lengths is to be recommended here. The question about 'handling' or 'picking up' the bones was very well answered. 'Opening times' and 'entry fees' were generally correctly inserted, but the final mark for the web address often led to mistakes - spelling was poor here even though 'Dinosaur Island' was already printed on the Paper.

**Question 8** was in response to an interview with a sports photographer and carried nine marks. The age of the photographer (43) here was often incorrect with '34' or '25' being offered by candidates. The next question was sometimes perfectly answered but on occasions candidates lost the mark. The idea of the father giving the child a camera was needed in order to score here. Then the idea of her finding or using a darkroom was needed. The two sports - tennis and windsurfing - were generally correctly answered, but the idea of the 'mast' in the next question gave rise to many attempts of 'mask' and the height of 28 metres was often stated without a measurement. The book title and the ISBN number were well done.

## **Part 3**

**Question 9** concerned disappearing forests and there were six marks available here. Attempts at **(a)** were very poor - candidates usually failed to give any statistics at all - eighty percent of woodlands and fifteen countries scored two marks here if correctly inserted. **Question (b)** was very well done and showed good evidence of understanding. Responses to **(c)** were often weak - the idea of trees covering more than forty percent of the land was needed, but an assortment of figures was usually given. Many candidates reiterated the question for the answer to **(d)** and wrote, 'stop the spread of deserts', failing to score. Careful focus on the demands of the question would stop this error. Some wrote about the soaking up of carbon and the refuge for wildlife and scored accordingly. **Question (e)** needed the idea of education and alternative income, and generally candidates demonstrated good understanding here.

**Question 10** concerned windpower and was quite well handled, demonstrating engagement with task and taped text. **(a)** simply needed the answer 'electricity'. Some fared well on the description of a wind turbine for **(b)** and showed understanding, but a huge range of numbers was provided for the percentage - 1.6% - for the answer to **(c)**. **Question (d)** needed the answer 'to avoid tax', but many candidates only partly explained this. **Question (e)** needed the idea of wind powering traffic lights, although many understood this as 'street lights'. **(f)** was quite well done, with the idea of the noise and danger to birds being well understood by most candidates.



<p><b>Paper 0510/05</b> <b>Oral Communication</b></p>
---

**General comments**

Moderators report again that in the vast majority of cases candidates were well prepared for this component and Examiners took great care to place candidates at ease. In a pleasing number of cases, lively and interesting oral examinations were conducted. Indeed, there continues to be a gradual improvement in the conduct of the examination.

Administrative procedures continue to be completed generally well, with most Centres showing good awareness of the external moderation process. This session saw a slight change in the format of the Reports issued to Centres. Three tick boxes were added as a means to inform Centres quickly of whether the tape quality was acceptable, of whether the sample sent was appropriate and whether procedures had been followed correctly. There were several observations made by Moderators:

- Moderators are still finding that they have to complete a surprising number of Amendment Forms because marks are being added and/or transcribed incorrectly. This is a time-consuming task for the External Moderators and should therefore be minimised as much as possible. It is recommended, therefore, that Centres nominate a person *other than the Examiner* (e.g. a colleague in the English Department) to check the addition of the marks on the Summary Form, and the subsequent transfer of those marks to the Mark Sheet (MS1). Mistakes made here are serious; some candidates are effectively being given the wrong mark (by the Centre) for their examination.
- It would appear that a rising number of Centres are failing to include the Moderator's copy of the Mark Sheet in the package sent to CIE. It is important for Moderators to see this form, so that accurate transcription of the marks can be confirmed. Given the situation described above, it is therefore important that *all* Centres ensure that the MS1 copy is included with the Summary Form and the tape(s).
- In general, the samples sent were appropriate. Please remember, however, to include the highest and the lowest marks in the range. It is not acceptable to send in marks which are 'almost' the highest and/or lowest.
- Some Centres are still sending recordings of all of their candidates. The instructions for preparing the sample sent to CIE are very clear and are printed on the reverse of the Summary Form. Ideally, Moderators prefer to receive the minimum number of recordings (10 for most Centres, or 15 or 20 for large Centres) *on one or two cassettes*. Centres sending a large number of cassettes should discontinue this practice and adjust their sampling procedure.
- Moderators noted that some Centres appeared not to explain the examination format to their candidates. The *Teacher's/Examiner's Notes* booklet asks Examiners to "explain briefly what is going to happen in the course of the test" (Page 4, note 8A). It is important, therefore, *that this is recorded*. Moderators are aware that in many Centres the candidates will have been prepared for the Test during 'mock' examination lessons (and that, therefore, they know what to expect). In these cases, *brief reference* to the procedure is all that is required. By contrast, at Centres where the Examiner(s) is/are meeting candidates for the first time, a full explanation of the Test format is preferred.

**Comments on specific aspects of the oral****The warm up**

There was again a considerable difference in the duration and the effectiveness of the warm ups. Examiners are reminded that the warm up serves two purposes: to place the candidate at ease and to perhaps indicate which Topic Card might be the most productive for discussion. At Centres where the candidates are known to the Teachers, it is of course likely that a short warm up is all that is needed. However, at Centres where candidates are meeting Examiners for the first time, the Examiner's skill and sensitivity in conducting an appropriate warm up is probably more apparent.

Warm ups should not be too long or too short – Centres would be wise to adhere to the 2-3 minutes suggested in the *Teacher's/Examiner's Notes*. The warm ups should not be too formal or formulaic – *the focus should be on the candidate* and an effort should be made to make that person feel as comfortable as possible, given that he or she is about to take an examination. Centres should not, therefore, be conducting the same warm up for all candidates.

### **The topic cards**

Moderators did not report any problems with the Topic Cards. It was felt that candidates were able to talk with ease and at some length about all of the topics.

Examiners are reminded, however, that it is permissible to use the main topic as a springboard for further discussion – this was noted in the case of Card B (Problems of change). This is much more productive than simply running through the prompts in a pedestrian manner.

### **The conversation**

In most cases, Examiners are conducting appropriate discussions with their candidates, and are approaching the Topic Card as a stimulus for conversation, and not a rubric. The delivery of speeches continues to become much less apparent and this is excellent news.

Some Examiners are reminded, however, that it is a *conversation* that is required. Ideally, this will be a shared discussion about the topic and any related issues. Examiners should not rely solely on the use of a series of questions – more productive dialogue will occur if candidates are encouraged to express their opinions and views. It is wise to remember that the examination *belongs to the candidate* and he or she needs to be given every opportunity to excel.

### **Assessment criteria**

Assessment was generally accurate. Where adjustment was made to Centres' marks, it tended to be the result of lenient marking.

Moderators report that the fluency criterion is sometimes over-rewarded. Fluency is not just the ability to talk continuously, but to do so using appropriate pronunciation and intonation, and to take note of the response of the listener. It is the fluency with which a candidate engages in conversation which is being tested. There are concerns, therefore, that too many candidates are being placed in Band 1 (9-10 marks) for fluency when they do not exhibit "a sustained ability to maintain a conversation and to contribute at some length".

### **Internal moderation**

Moderators are still experiencing problems with Centres who are using more than one Examiner, when there appears to be no need to do so.

At most Centres, the normal arrangement is that a single Examiner should conduct the tests and he or she should be responsible for awarding the marks to the candidates and for recording those marks on the relevant CIE forms. The use of more than one Examiner should be seen only at Centres with a large number of candidates. It is assumed that a single Examiner should be in a position to conduct at least twenty five oral tests – many Examiners have shown that they are able to cope with significantly more than this number.

Where more than one Examiner is required, Centres should ideally offer a training session or workshop to ensure that the Oral Tests are conducted in a similar manner. It is utterly unacceptable, for example, for two Examiners to be operating at a Centre, and for one to conduct a warm up while the other does not.

It is also important that steps are taken to ensure that the assessment criteria are applied consistently. It is very difficult for External Moderators to confirm competent examining when there is a difference among Examiners at the same Centre, in terms of the interpretation and application of the assessment criteria.

### **Advice to Centres and requests from Moderators**

- Moderators are very grateful to those large Centres (using a number of Examiners) which provide a separate (and additional) Summary Form listing the candidates who have been selected for the sample. (These should, of course, be the only recordings sent to CIE). It is hoped that *all large Centres* will follow suit and provide an extra form in due course.

- In some cases, pair-examining was found to be suspect. Centres choosing to examine candidates in pairs are reminded that a pair should comprise of candidates easily distinguishable, and that both candidates should be given the same Topic Card. In pair examining, the onus is very much on the Examiner to facilitate discussion and prevent candidates talking exclusively to each other. In these situations, Moderators expect to hear a three-way discussion. Centres who are choosing to examine candidates in pairs should think very carefully before doing so.
- Moderators would like all Examiners to pause the tape at Part C, while candidates take 2-3 minutes to consider their Topic Cards and prepare for discussion. There are too many problems arising from leaving the tape running and Moderators feel that pausing the tape will solve these problems.

<p><b>Paper 0510/06</b> <b>Coursework</b></p>
---

### **General comments**

In the ideal portfolio of coursework, a Moderator would see a candidate completing three different tasks, each with a different audience in mind. It would be very pleasing to see that candidates have been involved in group discussions and pair-work, in addition to making individual presentations.

While the above describes the ideal situation, Moderators have reported that this is being achieved by only a few Centres. However, if all Centres could work towards a greater variety of activities, this can only result in strengthening the component further.

### **Comments on specific aspects**

#### **Tasks**

The tasks chosen were generally suitable and varied, enabling the candidates to demonstrate their language skills appropriately. Examples of good tasks included realistic role plays, group discussions about controversial issues, planned and structured conversations between candidates, and individuals' responses to literary texts.

Centres should avoid the repetition of three similar tasks. It is not acceptable to ask candidates to deliver three speeches, for example, or to take part in three similar conversations, albeit on different topics. The result of these approaches is inevitably limited and disappointing coursework.

#### **Procedural obligations**

Moderators report that in cases where three distinct and appropriate tasks were set, Centres have provided candidates with suitable guidance and have helped to collate and organise interesting and productive material.

#### **Assessment**

Assessment was sound in almost all cases. However, Moderators noted that a degree of leniency continues to occur in cases where task-setting is limited to individual performance. As a result, candidates' fluency is being over-rewarded.

Centres are reminded that candidates need to be assessed using three criteria - structure, vocabulary and fluency - and the same Criteria Grid is used as in Paper 05 (the Oral Test). However, the Coursework option provides Centres with a much more flexible approach in terms of devising tasks and scenarios, and it therefore allows the testing of the criterion separately, if preferred.

### **Advice to Centres**

A Moderator is seeking to fulfil two main duties while listening again to a Centre's coursework: initially to confirm the Centre's interpretation and application of the assessment criteria, but also to confirm that a variety of appropriate tasks have been completed. For the moderation process to be completed efficiently, Centres should submit a recording of each candidate engaged in a discussion or a conversation. This might be with a Teacher/Examiner or it might be with another candidate. (Larger Centres will, of course, send a representative sample of individual candidates engaging in conversations.)

In addition to the above, it would be useful if Centres were to include one recording of any group discussions that have taken place.

It is not useful for the External Moderators to receive speeches as the only examples of oral coursework.

There is still some confusion at one or two Centres about the completion of appropriate Coursework. In these cases, it is recommended that candidates are entered for the Oral Test (0510/05).