## MARK SCHEME FOR the November 2004 question paper

## 0502 First Language Spanish

0502/2 Paper 2, Reading and Directed Writing (Extended), maximum raw mark 60

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were initially instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began. Any substantial changes to the mark scheme that arose from these discussions will be recorded in the published Report on the Examination.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the Report on the Examination.

- CIE will not enter into discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the November 2004 question papers for most IGCSE and GCE Advanced (A) and Advanced Subsidiary (AS) Level syllabuses.

Grade thresholds taken for Component 2 of Syllabus 0502 (IGCSE First Language Span November 2004 examination

|  | maximum | minimum mark required for grade: |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | mark <br> available | A | C | E | F |  |
| Component 2 | 60 | 42 | 30 | 19 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |

The threshold (minimum mark) for $B$ is set halfway between those for Grades $A$ and $C$.
The threshold for $D$ is set halfway between those for Grades $C$ and $E$.
The threshold for $G$ is set as many marks below the $F$ threshold as the $E$ threshold is above it.
Grade A* does not exist at the level of an individual component.
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The more the script is annotated, the better.

- Technical errors should be indicated. There is no mathematical computation of such errors, but they should be taken into account when allotting a language mark.
- Examples of good language use and well-made points should be ticked and the ticks taken into account when considering the final mark for the essay.
- Comments at the end of the essay, explaining what the examiner considers to be the weak/strong points of the answer, will be very helpful if the script needs to be re-marked at any stage.


## Part I - Question 1: Summary

Basándose en la información de los dos textos y utilizando sus propias palabras, escriba unas 250 palabras contestando las preguntas siguientes:
¿Cuáles son las causas y los efectos de la deforestación? y ¿hasta qué punto podría el ecoturismo ayudar a prevenirlas?

15 marks for handling of text, 5 marks for language and style

## Content (handling of text)

22 key points in the texts are identified in the order in which they occur.

- One mark should be awarded for each point clearly made by the candidate, up to a maximum of 15 .
- Points made over and above the maximum should be noted (' + ') in the margin and may be taken into account when awarding marks for Language and style (see below)
- Where a candidate makes a point its number should be noted in the margin. If the point is repeated is should be bracketed thus: (14R).
- Points that are not in either text should be marked 'IR' (irrelevant).
- Points that are not clearly made should be marked PNM and not credited.
- Where lifting takes place, give points for Content but bear in mind when awarding the Language mark
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| points: |  |  |
| Deforestation causes soil erosion |  |  |
| It can destabilise aquifers and so cause floods or drought |  |  |
| It reduces biodiversity |  |  |
| Forests are carbon reservoirs. Their destruction exacerbates global warming |  |  |
| The demand for wood encourages deforestation in cash-strapped third-world countries |  |  |
| Forests are also cleared for agriculture and stock-rearing |  |  |

6 Forests are also cleared for agriculture and stock-rearing
7 After deforestation, tropical soils become hard and fertile soil is washed away by rains
8 Deforestation can be followed and supplemented by desertification
9 Some of the species lost may be of medicinal value
10 Use of heavy machinery has increased the pace of deforestation,
11 ...but population pressure can lead to equally disastrous clearance by hand
12 Ultimately, deforestation endangers the whole planet
13
14
15
16 Ecotourism implies a sense of responsibility for the environment
17 It aims not to damage the places visited
18 It involves study of ecology \& culture, as well as enjoyment
19 Involvement of local people is encouraged
20 It has been demonstrated that ecotourism can benefit the environment and alleviate poverty
21 This is likely to increase in the future
22 It has the approval of the WWF
23 Ecotourists travel in small groups
24 But the pressure from ecotourism is now increasing and this is threatening to harm the environment

25 It needs to be carefully controlled
26
27
28
29
30
31
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The 5 additional marks should be allotted as follows:

## Language and style

| $\mathbf{5}$ (Excellent) | The causes and effects of deforestation are clearly and fully set out. Relevant <br> information from the second article is skilfully used to suggest how ecotourism <br> could help prevent deforestation. Facts and arguments are clearly drawn from <br> the text and not from the candidate's own ideas and prejudices. Clear, elegant <br> language with complex syntax where appropriate. Good organisation, good <br> linkage. Varied, precise vocabulary. Avoids irrelevance. No technical errors. |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{4}$ (Good) | Causes and effects clearly set out though a few points may be missing; <br> convincing arguments re ecotourism. Well rooted in the text; little intrusion of <br> candidate's own ideas. Clear, appropriate language. Generally good <br> organisation and good linkage; it is easy to follow the thread. Appropriate <br> vocabulary. Little irrelevance. Technical errors very slight. |
| $\mathbf{3}$ (Adequate) | Causes, effects and benefits are adequately described, but with some omissions <br> and/or muddled presentation. Use of texts is apparent, but candidate's own <br> ideas intrude in places. Some irrelevance. Language generally appropriate, but <br> unsophisticated and generally simple syntax. Attempts to link, but not always <br> connected; reader has to concentrate at times in order to follow thread. <br> Adequate vocabulary. Relatively few technical errors. |
| $\mathbf{2}$ (Weak) | Text not well handled; causes and effects not clear. Candidate's own ideas very <br> intrusive, with some confusion apparent. Considerable irrelevance. <br> Unsophisticated language, not always appropriate. Very simple syntax with <br> some clumsiness. Thread not easy to follow. Meaning may be obscure in <br> places. Thin vocabulary. A number of technical errors. |
| $\mathbf{1}$ (Poor) | Little use of text. No attempt to set out pros and cons. Thin, inappropriate use <br> of language. Confused and obscure. Many errors. |
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## Part 1 - Question 2: article for school magazine

Anualmente su colegio organiza un viaje de estudios para los alumnos en el último año esco Este año usted viajó con sus compañeros a un lugar apartado, de gran belleza natural. El viaje organizó la Asociación de Ecoturismo Ríos del Norte.

A su vuelta del viaje, usted decide redactar un artículo acerca de sus experiencias para la revista del colegio, con la intención de animar a otros estudiantes a que tomen parte.

Utilizando la información provista en los dos textos, escriba su propio artículo en el que explica por qué esos viajes benefician no solo al colegio y a sus estudiantes sino también al medioambiente y la población local.

## 15 marks for content, 5 for written expression

## Content

Obviously there is more relevant information in the second text, and weak candidates may draw very little on the first. For a top mark there must be a clear reference to both texts, eg the candidate may mention that at some point in the trip, they saw deforestation in progress, or its results; or were very impressed with the richness of the forest environment in its natural state and became very keen to help to prevent the sort of destruction described in the first text. They might have been offered souvenirs made from tropical hardwoods, or from endangered species; they might have got involved in an argument with another tourist, or a local, about the question of conservation of the environment versus exploitation, and/or about how third-world poverty produces pressure for the destruction of the environment.

| Band 1: 13-15 | Complete understanding of both texts is apparent. A lively, well-structured and <br> convincing account, couched in appropriate language. Details are adduced <br> from both texts to make a wide-ranging article. A vivid account of the trip, <br> drawing on material from text 2 but supplemented by the candidate's <br> imagination. It would certainly make other young people very keen to take <br> part. Arguments drawn from the texts convince the reader that ecotourist trips <br> are beneficial for participants, locals and the environment. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Band 2: 10-12 | Both texts have been well understood. A convincing account, perhaps a bit cut <br> and dried. Good use of texts - the second more than the first - to supply <br> corroborative detail of the trip and arguments in favour of ecotourism. <br> Sufficient imaginative input to make the account interesting to read. The <br> account would certainly arouse the interest of other young people. A good <br> case for ecotourism. |
| Band 3: 7-9 | Both texts have been broadly understood; text 2 is quite extensively used, but <br> there is scant/no detail from text 1. Some deficiencies of structure. <br> Imaginative input may be lacking, or alternatively swamp the input from the <br> texts. Young people might feel some interest in the possibility of taking part. <br> Arguments in favour of ecotourism adequate but somewhat muddled. |
| Band 4: 4-6 | Some understanding of texts is apparent. The account may be brief and/or <br> rather flat - not a particularly inspiring read. Imaginative input scanty, <br> alternatively most of the piece comes from the candidate's own imagination <br> with little contribution from the texts. An attempt to put the case for ecotourism, <br> but the arguments are incomplete. |
| Band 5: 1-3 | Limited answer. Little use is made of either text. Candidate appears not to <br> understand them, though there may be some lifting to bulk out the candidate's <br> own input. There is no real attempt to arouse enthusiasm in the reader. <br> Arguments not convincing or clearly rooted in texts. |
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## Written expression

| $\mathbf{5}$ | Well constructed and fluently written. Genuine commitment and enthusias <br> are conveyed. The experiences described seem 'real'. Appropriate use of <br> language: lively, idiomatic, but not too colloquial. Varied vocabulary. No, or <br> trifling, technical errors. A pleasure to read. |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Well constructed on the whole. Reads like an account of an interesting <br> experience. The language used is generally appropriate, but may be <br> excessively colloquial in places, or alternatively a little stilted. It is almost <br> always clear what point is being made. Reader's interest sustained. |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | Effort made to structure the piece. Some attempt to convey interest - not <br> always successful. May sound rather wooden and artificial. Alternatively, may <br> use excessively colloquial language. However, points are conveyed and <br> suitable vocabulary is used on the whole. Technical errors do not impede <br> communication. Reader may have to concentrate and/or make allowances in <br> order to follow narrative and the arguments. |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | Brief, poorly constructed. Not much sense that candidate is recounting an <br> interesting experience. Vocabulary limited, repetitive, not always suitable, but <br> communicates without ambiguity. Reader may lose thread of arguments. |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Scrappy, poorly constructed, disjointed; many errors; not always <br> comprehensible. |

## Part 2 - Question 3: job application

Lea la siguiente oferta de trabajo y escriba una carta de solicitud para el puesto. Utilizando propias palabras explique por qué usted es el candidato ideal para desempeñar este cargo Escriba unas 200 palabras en total.

## 15 marks for content and 5 for language and style

## Content marks are divided as follows: (a) 10 for the amount of relevant information given and (b) $\mathbf{5}$ for the candidate's ability to sell themselves

This is a straightforward task which puts the candidate in a familiar environment, but from the teacher's side rather than the pupil's. The content of the answers will be judged on (a) the amount of relevant information given in response to the specifications in the stimulus material (10 marks) and (b) the extent to which the candidate succeeds in 'selling' him/herself (5 marks).

Of course, the truth or otherwise of the candidate's statements is quite irrelevant - we are looking for a convincing invented persona for this task.
(a) The stimulus material requests the following information/qualities:

1 Expertise in teaching Spanish language
2 Relevant qualifications
3 Interest in professional development
4 Ability to teach wide age range
5 Enthusiasm and creativity
6 Five years' teaching experience
7 References
8 Must be capable of inspiring and motivating both teachers and pupils
9 Must be aware of aims and responsibilities
10 Willingness to take part in extra-curricular activities - gym, sport, music and chess are mentioned but this is clearly not an exclusive list
11 Experience of working abroad
12 Able to work in both British and Mexican educational systems
13 Able to teach IGCSE
14 Able to contribute to overall development of students.
Award one mark for each relevant piece of information that is clearly given in answer to one of these (actual or implied) questions, up to a maximum of 10. Record these marks in the margin. Points made over and above 10 may be credited under (b) (put a ' + ' sign in the margin to note points made over and above 10).

| Page 7 | Mark Scheme |
| ---: | ---: |
|  | FIRST LANGUAGE SPANISH - N |

(b) Candidate's ability to sell him/herself

| $\mathbf{5}$ marks | The candidate sounds like the ideal person for the job. The stimulus material is <br> used and candidate gives precise information. The application conveys enthusias, <br> for language, commitment to teaching, willingness to learn and improve, leadership <br> skills, adaptability and a willingness to contribute fully to the life of the school. |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{4}$ marks | The application would certainly earn the candidate a place on the shortlist. Answers <br> are given to all the most important questions in the stimulus material, though some <br> of the answers may be a little brief and/or vague. The candidate sounds like a good <br> teacher who might be able to lead a department; s/he would clearly be willing to <br> contribute to extra-curricular activities as well. |
| $\mathbf{3}$ marks | The application would at least be considered. There are some omissions from the <br> content, but these do not relate to the most vital points. The candidate comes <br> across as a competent person who might fit in with the school environment. |
| $\mathbf{2}$ marks | The application would not be considered favourably. Some important points are <br> missing, or are not adequately answered. However, the candidate manages to <br> convey some interest in the position and in the school. There may be some <br> irrelevance. |
| $\mathbf{1}$ mark | The application would most likely be rejected. Important points are missing from the <br> answer. The candidate comes over as a muddled, vague person who would be <br> unlikely to make a good head of department, or be an asset to the school. |
| $\mathbf{0}$ marks | Nothing to reward. |

Total (a) and (b) to give a final content mark out of 15

## Language and style

| $\mathbf{5}$ | Correctly formulated and well planned. Elegant formal style. Good linkage, varied <br> and appropriate vocabulary. No technical errors. The claim to be an expert Spanish <br> teacher is fully backed up by the application itself. |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Correctly formulated and on the whole well planned. Appropriate but not quite <br> elegant style. Appropriate vocabulary, with some variety. Technical errors very <br> slight. Clearly a person who can set an example of correct writing in Spanish. |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | Some faults in layout and linkage. Language generally formal; perhaps a little <br> monotonous and with unambitious syntax. Might pass muster as a Spanish teacher, <br> but would not set a glowing example to pupils. |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | Faulty layout; points do not always follow logically. Generally simple syntax. <br> Meaning is conveyed without ambiguity, but there is no sense of polish. Technical <br> errors create an unfavourable impression - one would not want to let this person <br> loose on a Spanish language class! |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Poor layout; muddled. No attempt at appropriate style. Meaning not always clear. <br> Many errors. There is no way this person would be asked to teach Spanish <br> language. $\quad$. |

