

# GREEK (FOREIGN LANGUAGE)

Paper 0543/02

Reading and Directed Writing

## General comments

**Section 1** was answered well with most candidates scoring full or nearly full marks. In **Section 2** most candidates coped well with the tasks. A small number of candidates found **Section 3** difficult, losing marks owing to a lack of manipulation of the language.

Generally, candidates' spelling was good although there was some phonetic spelling and some candidates omitted accents or used them incorrectly.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section 1**

#### **Exercise 1 Questions 1–5**

**Question 1** was usually answered correctly. A small number of candidates found **Questions 2, 3, 4 and 5** difficult with the word ηθοποιός being the least recognised piece of vocabulary.

#### **Exercise 2 Questions 6–10**

**Questions 6 and 9** were answered correctly by most candidates. A small number of candidates answered **Questions 7, 8 and 10** incorrectly.

#### **Exercise 3 Questions 11–15**

Many candidates scored full marks in this exercise. However, in **Question 11** a sizeable group of candidates chose answer E rather than the correct answer. **Question 12** was answered correctly with only a very small number of candidates answering **Questions 13, 14 and 15** incorrectly.

#### **Exercise 4 Question 16**

Most candidates performed well in this exercise scoring 3 marks for Communication and at least 1 mark for Language. A very small number of candidates failed to read the rubric and described their own weekend arrangements rather than those in the pictures. This meant that they did not score for communication and therefore also lost language marks as they had not completed the required tasks.

In general, the standard of spelling was good although there were frequent phonetic misspellings of the words *πηγαίνω* and *παίζουμε*.

Some candidates omitted accents or used them incorrectly. In order to score full marks for language, two verbs had to be written and used correctly, including the accents.

It should be noted that it is possible to score full marks with very brief but correct responses as well as more extensive responses.

## Section 2

### Exercise 1 Questions 17–24

In general, candidates coped well with this exercise and were able to locate the answers in the text. A number of candidates had difficulties answering **Question 17** with a variety of responses being given. A recurring problem in **Question 18** was that candidates failed to manipulate the language so that their response did not answer the question.

### Exercise 2 Question 25

In this exercise, candidates not only had to complete all the required tasks but also expand their answers in order to gain all ten marks for Communication.

Some candidates omitted or misused accents which affected their mark for Accuracy. All verbs had to be spelt and used correctly to score highly. The correct use of a range of verbs and more complex vocabulary was also necessary for full Accuracy marks. There was frequent misspelling of verbs with the vowel sounds causing most difficulties. Some candidates had a tendency to replace  $\theta$  with  $\delta$ .

In general, the vocabulary for this exercise was known and used successfully.

## Section 3

### Exercise 1 Questions 26–31

Candidates performed well in this exercise overall. A small number of candidates struggled with **Questions 26, 27 and 28**. **Questions 29 and 30** were usually answered correctly.

Misspelling of verb endings was tolerated provided that the verb was phonetically correct. Again there was omission and misuse of accents which was tolerated provided that the meaning was clear.

In those cases where the candidate had chosen True/False correctly but then did not score for the justification, the most common reason was that s/he had simply lifted wholesale from the text without any attempt to select the appropriate bit of information. Some candidates failed to read the rubric and also gave a justification for True responses which was unnecessary.

### Exercise 2 Questions 32–38

The most common problem in this section was the failure to manipulate the language of the text. An indiscriminate lift from the passage was not usually accepted and any phrase which had not been manipulated to answer the question accurately did not score. This was especially noticeable in **Question 32** where a large number of candidates lifted *το πρωινό ξύπνημα / η ετοιμασία* from the text which on its own was insufficient to score. In **Question 34**, a common problem was to answer without making the subject of the sentence clear.

Candidates should be aware that sometimes a brief accurate response may be sufficient.

# GREEK (FOREIGN LANGUAGE)

Paper 0543/03

Speaking

## General comments

As in 2009, a high level of communication skills was displayed. Teacher/Examiners were mostly well prepared and aware of how to elicit the best performance from their candidates. There were instances, however, where the threefold nature of the Speaking examination was difficult to distinguish because Test 2 (the Topic Presentation/Conversation) and Test 3 (the General Conversation) were presented as one test. When this happens, the moderation process becomes harder for the Moderator, as it is difficult to verify the marks allocated for each one of these tests if they are not announced and conducted as separate parts of the Speaking examination. There were also a number of instances where the Conversation sections were rather brief. In the interests of fairness to candidates please try to keep to the timings as set out in the Teachers' Notes.

## **Administration**

Minor instances of clerical errors and a small number of missing MS1 forms were reported this year. Centres are reminded to send both the Working Mark Sheet **and** the Moderator copy of the MS1 mark sheet to CIE with the recorded samples of their candidates.

There were also instances of Centres with a large number of candidates sending all their candidates' recordings for moderation whereas only a sample of six recordings from across the range of marks was required. However, please note that the size of the recorded sample required for external moderation will change in 2011. Please consult the 2011 0543 Greek syllabus booklet (available on the CIE website) for further information.

## **Quality of recording**

The quality of recording was good in most Centres and cassettes were mostly correctly labelled.

## **Duration of tests**

As mentioned earlier there were instances of short or overlong examinations in Test 2 (the Topic Presentation/Conversation) or Test 3 (the General Conversation). Teacher/Examiners are reminded that each candidate's Speaking examination must consist of the following three parts: Test 1 which includes Role play A and Role play B (approximately 5 minutes), Test 2: which includes the Topic presentation prepared in advance by the candidate and the follow-up conversation relevant to the topic (approximately 5 minutes) and finally Test 3 which consists of a general conversation on at least two or three other topics chosen from those specified in the Defined Content Booklet (again approximately 5 minutes), making the total time of the Speaking examination about 15 minutes (about five minutes per section).

In cases where the Role plays A and B last less than 5 minutes in total, there is no need to extend the following parts of the examination in order to compensate. Also care should be taken to ensure that no section of the Speaking examination is omitted. In the most successful Speaking examinations, it was clear that the teacher/Examiner was listening to what the candidate had to say and that the conversation was a natural and spontaneous development of topics which the candidate had encountered throughout their course of learning.

## **Application of the mark scheme**

Generally, marking in Centres was close to the agreed standard. Small instances of harsh or rather generous marking was reported and some adjustments were necessary.

## **Comments on specific questions**

### ***Test 1: Role plays A and B***

#### ***Role plays A***

Generally, candidates performed very well and were often awarded full marks for this part of the Speaking examination. However, Centres should be reminded to encourage candidates to attempt all parts of each task. Marks can only be awarded for completion of tasks set by CIE and so it is vital that teacher/Examiners stick to the tasks specified in the Teachers' Notes booklet and on the Role play cards. If only one part of the task is completed, only one mark can be awarded. Candidates should take time to act the scenario appropriately and not be rushed quickly through it producing unnaturally brief exchanges with the teacher/Examiner.

#### ***At the railway station***

Candidates coped well with this Role play and only a small number of candidates did not quite use the appropriate register in Tasks 1 and 5 when talking to an adult, such as making use of the plural in pronouns and verbs: *Καλημέρα σας* or *Μπορείτε να μου πείτε από ποια πλατφόρμα φεύγει το τρένο;* In Task 3 some responses were unnaturally constructed with those candidates not quite displaying the appropriate language to match the task (by saying, for example, *Μπορώ να έχω ένα απλό εισιτήριο, παρακαλώ;* or *Θα ήθελα ένα εισιτήριο με επιστροφή, παρακαλώ.*).

#### ***Arranging to meet with a friend***

All the tasks of this Role play were well done and candidates seemed to have been well trained to formulate the required structures and questions when dealing with Tasks 4 and 5. They all used the appropriate register when talking to a friend and a variety of natural responses to the tasks were displayed.

#### ***At the street market***

Again, candidates seemed quite comfortable in responding to the tasks of this scenario. Natural exchanges and questions gave most candidates full marks for this Role play. As before, only a small number of candidates did not quite use the appropriate register when talking to an adult, such as making use of the plural in pronouns and verbs: *Γεια σας* or *Ξέρετε πού μπορώ να αγοράσω ψάρια;* or *Σας ευχαριστώ.*

#### ***Role plays B***

As usual, the B Role plays were more challenging in that they required candidates to use different and more demanding tenses and to explain and justify where necessary. Candidates, however, found them accessible, with even the weaker ones able to gain marks when led through the tasks in a calm and sympathetic manner by the teacher/Examiner.

#### ***Enquiring about a course at a language college***

Most candidates came up with very convincing and well-formulated responses to this Role play's tasks. Only a small number gave inappropriate responses for Task 1 where a formal introduction was required. Also, in Task 2 some candidates were not careful to address all parts of the task in order to gain full marks for themselves.

#### ***Conversation with a doctor at the hospital***

Candidates were clearly able to explain to the doctor at length about their accident and their symptoms. They were also able to formulate appropriate answers and to use more complex vocabulary and structures in their exchanges with the teacher/Examiner.

#### ***Conversation with your friend in Crete***

Again, candidates performed quite well in dealing with all tasks of this Role play, which required candidates to apologise, explain and offer suggestions. All candidates successfully managed to engage themselves in natural and interesting conversations with the teacher/Examiner. They gave plausible responses and explanations to all the questions asked, and they were also quite competent in using more complex and polished language in their answers.

## **Test 2: Topic Presentation/Conversation**

This section of the examination gives candidates the chance to prepare vocabulary and structures in advance and is intended to give them a confident start to the Conversation sections. Generally, candidates chose topics appropriate to their level of linguistic ability although teacher/Examiners should advise candidates not to choose 'Myself' as a topic as it can become far too general and leave little to be exploited in the General Conversation section. A wide range of topics was heard from most candidates but there were instances where a limited range of questions used by the teacher/Examiner deprived candidates of opportunities to display their knowledge and ability in handling the language and of using different tenses in their responses.

A small number of candidates did not give a presentation and teacher/Examiners are reminded that candidates are expected to prepare and present a topic, rather than their teacher/Examiner just asking them questions about it. More specifically, candidates should be allowed to speak for about one or two minutes on their chosen topic before the teacher/Examiner begins to ask questions.

Overall a number of interesting presentations were given on 'Life in the country where I live', 'My future plans', 'My favourite sport', 'My ideal holidays', 'Technology in the modern world' etc. Such topics enable candidates to compare and contrast past and present experiences to great effect. Likewise, "The job I would like to do" proved to be a rich source where a natural and spontaneous conversation took place after the initial presentation of the topic. Topics such as "The importance of a healthy lifestyle", "Visiting Africa" or "My spare-time activities" made for very interesting listening. The best performances were to be found in Centres where a natural and spontaneous conversation took place after the initial presentation of the topic. There were many instances of good examining which enabled candidates to work in different tenses and to give and justify their opinions.

Teacher/Examiners are reminded that candidates as well as Moderators find it useful to be told when this section of the examination is over and that they are moving onto the General Conversation section. Also keeping to the time specified for each section of the examination is important as a matter of fairness for all candidates.

## **Test 3: General Conversation**

As in the Topic Conversation, a good range of high-quality performances was heard. Teacher/Examiners, however, are reminded that they should aim to cover at least two or three topics in this section of the examination. These should be different for different candidates and should be chosen by the teacher/Examiner so as not to overlap with the Topic Conversation. Teacher/Examiners should remember to ask questions which enable candidates to expand upon information and use a variety of tenses and structures. Closed questioning techniques which elicit *ναι/όχι* responses are best avoided in favour of questions such as: *εξήγησέ μου πώς θα..., για ποιο λόγο προτιμάς..., τι είναι αυτό που σε κάνει να..., με ποιον τρόπο θα καταφέρεις να...* and so on.

## **2011 examination**

As mentioned at the start of this report, the sampling arrangements for external moderation are changing in 2011, and Centres are requested to consult the 2011 0543 Greek syllabus (available on the CIE website) for full details.

Additionally, please note that the examination format for IGCSE Greek Paper 3 will be changing in 2011 to include a Listening Role play. Please see the 2011 syllabus for a description of the new paper. Specimen papers are available on the CIE website.

# GREEK (FOREIGN LANGUAGE)

Paper 0543/04  
Continuous Writing

## General comments

The majority of scripts received this year were of a high standard. Most candidates were competent in the language and had the linguistic skills to cope well with the tasks required. However a number of marks were lost, even by able candidates, due to exceeding the word limit. As always candidates should be reminded of the importance of addressing all the tasks of each question within the limit of 140 words, as thereafter no marks can be awarded either for communication or language.

Candidates should also be reminded of the importance of linguistic accuracy in their answers. A number of marks were again lost because of careless spelling and basic errors of grammar. In the use of verbs in particular, where accurate spelling includes the correct use of the accent, many marks were lost as candidates did not make an attempt to use accents.

The highest marks for language were awarded to those who not only displayed a rich and varied vocabulary addressing all the tasks within the word limit, but were also able to sustain a sequence of correct Greek containing a range of structures of linguistic accuracy.

As ever, the ability to use appropriate tenses is assessed in the paper. Present and future are normally required in **Question 1** where a letter or an article is frequently set. In **Question 2** Simple or Imperfect past is needed for the narrative set in the past. Candidates, in general, displayed high ability in using the appropriate tenses in their answers. More able candidates were rewarded for the appropriate use not only of the past tense but also of irregular verbs in present, past and future tenses as well as correct forms of the conditionals and the subjunctive. However, as mentioned earlier, marks were lost in cases of omissions or mistakes in the use of accents in verbs.

A variety of correctly used pronouns, adjectives, participles, connectives, adverbs and prepositions was again this year a feature of the best scripts. In **Question 1(a)** where the opening and closing of a formal letter was required most candidates were rewarded for displaying appropriate and accurate language in doing this. In **Question 1(b)** on the other hand, where the writing of an article was required a number of marks were lost in cases where candidates used letter writing formalities.

In terms of the assessment of effective communication, all candidates displayed good understanding of the tasks set out in the rubric and they responded to all of them to a satisfactory degree.

Presentation and handwriting were in general of good quality.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Question 1(a) Excessive use of cars in our towns**

This topic was as equally popular as **Question 1(b)**, and most candidates were able to write interesting and informative letters. The rubric was well understood by all candidates and the presentation of the opinions and suggestions in Task 3 of the question was well constructed and the ideas were skilfully explained.

As mentioned earlier some answers were more lengthy and a few marks were lost for Communication. Most candidates, however, were able to score quite highly for Communication for fairly simple statements, employing appropriate tenses and handling correctly irregular verbs.

The required elements were relatively simple for this question as all statements were written in the present tense.

In describing the means of transport that exist in their towns, the vast majority of candidates gave detailed and informative accounts of the different ways to travel in their town.

For the second task most candidates wrote again lengthy and interesting answers explaining the different ways they prefer to travel in their town and the reasons behind their choices. In most scripts their preferred way of travelling was using the bus because they could sit and chat with their friends, using their bikes for short distances because it is good exercise, or using the tram because it is air-conditioned and comfortable and they could travel with their friends.

In answering the third task about the problems caused in towns because of the excessive use of cars, the most able candidates gave interesting and informative explanations displaying their knowledge and linguistic skills in dealing with the consequences for the environment and for the quality of life. In some scripts the thoughts and suggestions about ways of solving the problems caused by cars in towns displayed originality and innovation. As mentioned earlier a disappointingly large number of candidates had reached 140 words before they mentioned this point and could not be awarded a Communication Mark.

Generally, the question enabled even the weaker candidates to score marks for both Communication and Language for using simple statements in the present tense while at the same time offering the stronger candidates the opportunity to show off their Greek in employing more complex and polished language.

### Question 1(b) Future plans

This question was answered by a good number of candidates, and they had plenty to say about their future plans in relation to what career they would like to follow when they finish school, about how they will be able to achieve this and also their explanations of what kind of job they would never like to do and the reasons for this.

As in **Question 1(a)** the required elements were relatively simple, the correct tense of all statements being either present subjunctive or future (*θέλω να σπουδάσω* or *θα δώσω εξετάσεις*).

There were references to a variety of different jobs, the most popular being doctor, vet or manager in their family business. All explanations for their choices were well constructed and presented using rich vocabulary and structures, with better candidates displaying a good range of idiom and more complex language for which they were rewarded accordingly.

The third task again required the use of the present subjunctive or future tense in describing their least favourite jobs as well as a number of irregular but common verbs in statements like, *δεν μου αρέσει να βλέπω αίματα* or *θα πρέπει να δουλεύω πολλές ώρες*, the most unpopular jobs in this case being doctor again because of the hard work and dealing with sick people or being a teacher because of children's behaviour in schools today.

As in **Question 1(a)**, a number of answers were longer than 140 words resulting in some marks being lost for Communication. However most candidates were again able to score quite highly for Communication for fairly short and simple statements, employing present and future tenses and handling appropriately idioms and regular or irregular verbs.

Register was not a problem and the question proved to be a fair one as almost all candidates were able to find something to say about each task, and the best were able to show their knowledge and linguistic skills in detailed explanations about their favourite or least favourite jobs.

The quality of answers was similar in most scripts with just a few exceptions scoring lower marks because of poor quality of language.

The question again enabled even the weaker candidates to score marks for both Communication and Language for using simple statements in the present and future tenses while at the same time offering the stronger candidates the opportunity to display more sophisticated and complex language.

## Question 2 What happened while I was babysitting

The open ended nature of the narrative enabled gifted candidates to shine, but also offered opportunity for weaker candidates to display their knowledge in dealing with the language. All answers contained complex structures in explaining what happened as soon as they were left alone with the neighbour's children and dog. This is shown by the fact that most candidates, both stronger and weaker, performed equally well in this question as in **Question 1**.

Most candidates seemed to have read the rubric carefully and their story addressed both tasks appropriately. Nearly all understood that they had to explain a series of events during that afternoon when they were babysitting and express their reactions to the situation. Only a very small number of candidates failed to respond to all elements of each task, not gaining for this reason the allocated marks for this answer, or lost a number of marks because of starting their story by repeating the rubric.

All candidates had realistic and reasonable stories about what took place as soon as they were left alone with the kids, and all thought of dealing with the situation responsibly in order to restore order. The chapter of misfortunes and rapid events was told with a good sense of humour by the stronger candidates.

Many began the story by giving details about their neighbour's children and dog, then started to explain what exactly happened and what were their feelings and reactions to the events. Almost all candidates scored a Communication mark for expressions like *δεν ήξερα τι να κάνω, τους υποσχέθηκα να, αποφάσισα να ετοιμάσω κάτι για να φάνε*. Then they went on to unfold events that took place after this reaction and they concluded their story by explaining how the situation was dealt with and what were the parents' reactions when they returned, what kind of explanations had to be given to them and how the story ended.

Candidates were very inventive in writing their answers. The sudden events were described with great variety and imagination. The rapid development of mishaps ranged from a burglar breaking into the house, a fire started in the kitchen while trying to cook something for the children, or most commonly the children and dog misbehaving or even running out of the house into the street. In many scripts the fire brigade, the police or the parents themselves had to be called. The variety of reactions to these events was described skilfully by most candidates, the most common being panic, fear, cold sweat and heart pounding. The end of the story was also imaginative and was mostly described as having to face angry parents, embarrassing explanations and resolution of never wanting to do this ever again or even not receiving the promised money. Eventually the problems were resolved, their good relationship with their neighbours was restored, and some logical explanations were given for what happened (the kids were always little monsters).

Overall the experience was described as negative with only a small number of scripts describing a positive and surprisingly pleasant and successful experience.

Careless errors were found on some scripts with inaccurate adjective cases or the wrong verb endings. Also a number of scripts contained language with no use of accents at all. In those cases marks were lost for Language.

Finally, candidates should be generally congratulated for their performance in dealing with this year's questions.