

# ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

Papers 0510/01 and 0510/02

Reading and Writing

(Core and Extended)

## General comments

The majority of the candidates seemed to have responded well to the papers and found the tasks well within their capabilities. Weaker candidates did not always complete the paper, with Exercises 4, 5, 6 and 7 being omitted. However, with the inception of the new format papers, many more candidates are managing their time well and completing the paper, completing exercises in full and obeying the rubric requirements. Unfortunately, a number of candidates still failed to read the questions carefully, particularly with respect to interrogatives - What? Why? How? - this caused some confusion to weaker candidates.

In weaker centres low scores only were achieved, but across the whole cohort the marks ranged widely. A lot of candidates struggled with the rigours of the Extended tier and may have been better entered for Core tier. There was also a significant minority who were very able and coped extremely well, almost at first language level.

Punctuation is weak in many centres and poor spelling has denied candidates marks this session, particularly in Exercise 1 and Exercise 3. Handwriting is still a concern from certain centres. Handwriting which is not clear or legible will result in lower marks if the Examiners are unable to understand what is being conveyed. Clear handwriting and good presentation aid effective communication.

Candidates from most centres seemed to have been well prepared for the updated version of Reading/Writing papers, and candidates appeared to know what was expected of them, even if, in the stress of the test itself, they did not perform as they would have wished.

Some candidates are still ignoring the instruction not to write in the Examiner's margin, which makes the Examiners' work more difficult. There are usually blank pages for candidates to use if they run out of space.

## **Exercise 1: Keep Your Car Alive**

This was a very accessible first exercise with most candidates gaining some marks. **Questions (a), (d) and (g) (i)** (Extended) were the most frequently correct answers.

**Question (a)** Almost always answered correctly by the majority even if spelling was sometimes incorrect (this was not penalised). Most wrote a sentence lifting from the text.

**Question (b)** Many achieved the mark here but some candidates omitted the second part of the answer 'trying to protect'.

**Question (c)** Many wrote about the leather 'cracking' which was incorrect. Other candidates correctly answered the question.

**Question (d)** 'Brake gently' was the most frequent of the answers given. Some candidates lost the mark by misspelling 'break'.

**Question (e)** Some candidates mentioned the oil sitting at the bottom of the engine, others correctly identified one of the options in the mark scheme.

**Question (f)** This posed a problems for a number of candidates. Many re-iterated the idea of oil sitting at the bottom of the engine or, if they did correctly identify rust as the problem, they failed to relate it correctly to the question being asked.

**Question (g)** (Extended only). Better candidates mentioned that the problem was with tyres in and nearly all identified the danger connected to this. Some did identify the fact that there increased fuel usage but wrong answers just mentioned extra costs without explaining how these caused.

### Exercise 2: Snakes

Most candidates found this exercise more challenging than the previous one. The most able did well and dealt with the questions effectively but weaker candidates struggled with the text, the graph and the questions. The additional Extended level questions were quite challenging and discriminated well.

**Question (a)** Many candidates got the right answer. A few candidates wrote 'to play music to cobras to make small children rise out of baskets', indicating that either the candidates did not understand the question or did not check their answers.

**Question (b)** Again this was challenging for some who wrote incorrectly about the snake charmers' lack of ability to attract crowds or that they were finding it difficult to live.

**Question (c)** A number of candidates failed to realise that the question included the word, 'originally' and therefore answered with Salenager rather than Bengal. Those who had read the question carefully did get it right.

**Question (d)** A lot of candidates had difficulties finding the correct information on the graph and instead answered from the text, giving a meaningless list, 'the profession of wildlife television programmes and films'. There were some odd spellings of 'experts' even though it appeared in the stimulus.

**Question (e)** A comparison was rarely made. Expression such as '600 rupees more' often appeared. In the Core paper many candidates did not read the question properly and gave answers which referred to the last 40 or 20 years. Others gave a list of numbers (some correct and some incorrect) without qualifying what they were.

**Question (f)** Most candidates identified the right information but often repeated the same idea in two different ways, thereby losing one mark.

**Question (g)** Generally well answered, with candidates giving a variety of correct answers from the mark scheme options.

**Question (h)** Weaker candidates were unable to spot the 'negative' attitude of the snake charmers and some responded with the attitude of the younger generation instead.

**Question (i)** (Extended only) Weaker candidates were unable to find four details and tended to repeat material in previous questions. Stronger candidates did manage to find some points but only a few gained full marks.

### Exercise 3: Charity work application (Extended)

Performance on the form-filling exercise was uneven with some candidates doing very well and others making careless mistakes or not understanding precise requirements. More preparation needs to be done to encourage candidates to read the instructions very carefully. This is not a difficult exercise per se but there is much room for improvement.

Male/Female: the correct method of deletion was used but the wrong option was often chosen and occasionally there was a deletion *and* a circling which made it unclear which option the candidate had chosen.

Age Group: this was often given as 18 rather than the correct option being circled.

Home address: many are still lifting directly and incorrectly from the text, giving the unnecessary preposition 'at'.

Occupation: some wrote 'just left school' or 'charity worker' or left the question unanswered.

Course of study: this proved challenging for a lot of candidates who left it blank. There were some incorrect spellings of 'medicine' which was given to the candidates in the text.

Proposed Charity event: this was often confused with the next section on the name of the charity where the whole phrase 'helping the Young Diabetes Trust' was incorrectly lifted. Many missed out the key idea that there was a bicycle ride across the length of Cuba.

Previous experience: was usually in the first person but some did use the 3<sup>rd</sup> person and lost marks.

Length of Time: was usually correct.

Additional information: candidates are reminded of the need to transcribe website addresses accurately; it is not advisable to place a full stop at the end of it.

The sentence writing was disappointing. Once again some candidates failed to take notice of the prompt to write 'between 12 and 20 words.' Many wrote well beyond this length and a few wrote less than the minimum. Some candidates wrote two or even three sentences. Spelling was careless and expression was sometimes muddled.

### **Exercise 3: World Games Application (Core)**

Core candidates are more familiar with this part of the examination and, in general, did well. However, many did not follow the instructions to use capital letters and to delete and circle.

#### Personal Details

Many lapsed into lower case especially in the spelling of the surname HIGSON.

The age was usually correct but the address often had been copied from the text and included the preposition 'in'.

The telephone number was usually correct.

#### Experience

The number of years experience was sometimes given as ten rather than six. The circling was usually well done and most candidates correctly identified options on the mark scheme.

#### Medals and Achievements

Often 'team' was missed from the answer although 'youngest vaulter' was usually correctly identified. Many candidates still wrote in the third person and a very small minority included their own personal details.

#### Contacts

This was usually well done although there were a few omissions of one or the other name. In general, spelling was accurate.

The sentence writing exercise was problematic. Many did not identify the first idea indicated on the mark scheme and a number made spelling and language errors in the second sentence which confused meaning.

#### **Exercise 4: Gorillas**

This was a very accessible exercise for both tiers. There were some challenges for the weaker candidates but most managed to score some marks.

Points 1 and 2 were frequently correct although some Extended candidates gave 'same temperament' or 'sense of humour' which are not physical characteristics.

Points 3, 4, 5 and 6 were the most frequently correct responses but some candidates also wrote 'outside enclosure' which did not address the heading.

Points 7 and 8 were least likely to be correct. Often candidates wrote 'combining signs to invent new words' or incomplete answers involving the use of fingers.

Points 9 and 10 were often correctly answered although some gave Michael human attributes.

#### **Exercise 5: Gorillas (Core)**

Encouragingly, Core candidates did reasonably well in this exercise. Most managed the word length requirement but few managed to really summarise the notes that had been made in Exercise 4. There was extensive lifting in the majority of answers given and where candidates did try to use their own words they seemed to get confused about what they were writing about. Expression was sometimes muddled.

#### **Exercise 5: Silence (Extended)**

Good answers identified the relevant paragraphs, picked out key points and made an attempt to express ideas in their own words, more or less within the word limit. However, the overall response was variable and many did write well above the maximum word length. Candidates must be reminded that they are writing a summary and there is a set word length for this. Anything which exceeds this maximum length is not marked. Some candidates wasted time summarising the background and problems of noise in general, often ignoring the rubric. There was quite a lot of lifting from the text too which resulted in fairly low language marks.

#### **Exercise 6: Social Club**

This was generally done well by most candidates at both tiers. At the top end, the task produced interesting, detailed and developed answers.

Weaker candidates generalised too much and did not give enough detail for high content marks, for example, 'the social club does social things'. Better candidates gave much detail, addressed the rubric prompts and engaged the reader's interest, setting a suitable tone and register. For example, 'the social club is for candidates who want to watch classics and films', 'the visit to the island was successful because we raised lots of money for sick children'. In some answers, however, the second prompt was not addressed.

Some were not entirely sure what a social club did but if the response addressed the rubric prompts then marks were awarded. For example, some centres wrote about cleaning up polluted beaches or doing some work within the community itself. These were permissible responses.

#### **Exercise 7: Sporting Event**

This writing exercise seemed to strike a chord with many candidates and some enthusiastic responses emerged. In better answers, the tone and register were often excellent and would have convinced any recipient.

Weaker responses relied heavily on the prompts and original ideas were absent. Little if any development or argument was given. Some gave the viewpoint of relatives and friends rather than themselves, perhaps demonstrating that they had not read the rubric carefully.

In both exercises, spelling was often a problem and correct punctuation was rare. There was much mixing of tenses with subject/verb agreement sometimes poor. Examples include, 'the social club are', 'our recent activity were...' There is a need for greater concentration on accuracy in these areas.

# ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

Paper 0510/03

Paper 3 Listening (Core)

## General comments

There was a wide range of achievement, and the full range of marks was awarded by examiners. Many candidates had clearly been well-prepared for the test and knew what to expect. A considerable number of candidates, however, struggled to build up momentum and scored low marks as a result.

As in previous sessions, spelling was not taken into account in accordance with the 'listening for understanding' ethos of the component; phonetic attempts at the answer could therefore be rewarded unless this made a difference in meaning.

Examiners reported that many gaps continue to be left. It is always a good strategy to have an attempt at the answer, particularly if it makes contextual sense. Candidates should be encouraged to offer responses to all questions even if they feel their spelling may be inaccurate.

A number of candidates failed to complete the true/false tick boxes for **Questions 9 and 10**, leaving some boxes empty. It is obviously in candidates' interest to complete all 22 boxes.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Part 1**

Generally candidates responded well to this section of the paper.

**Question 1** was well answered with most candidates offering 'second floor' as the answer. There were variations in the spelling of floor, and where phonetic attempts were reasonable (e.g. flor, flore) a mark was allowed. 'Flour' was a common answer, and this could not be allowed.

**Question 2** was usually correctly answered with most candidates indicating that Darrel needed rest, or to take rest.

**Question 3** 10.35 was the usual response, although examiners reported seeing 10.30 and 10.40.

**Question 4** Most candidates appeared to hear that 'free lesson(s)' was the response required. A number struggled with the spelling of lesson, however. 'Lesson' was common (and was allowed), but 'lesion' was not allowed. There were many candidates who felt that they had heard 'three lessons' instead of a free lesson.

**Question 5** Very few candidates were able to recognise that it was a library card which qualified Hammad for a reduction, offering ID card or college card instead. However, most candidates detected that a passport was also required. Passport was often spelled 'passaport', which was permitted.

**Question 6** This question proved to be very difficult for many candidates, who failed to recognise that Thandie needed to perform an action to resolve her difficulty – i.e. that she needed *to cross* the busy road, or *to use* the subway.

**Part 2**

This part of the paper comprised two form-filling exercises.

**Question 7** with five available marks was based on an interview with a rug maker. The length of the rug was noted by most candidates correctly as 2 metres, but very few candidates were able to recognise that '...where made' should be preceded by place or origin for the answer to make sense. Candidates need to be aware that it might not be sufficient to place the words in the gaps in any order. The quality of the wool was generally noted as soft, with the cheaper wool being rougher, but most candidates offered more than one response to each, which was unnecessary. Pattern was commonly proposed for the last detail, but was offered in a variety of spellings – e.g. patton, patten, paton. Partner was a common error here.

**Question 8** was in response to an interview with Luigi Rigoletti – the salesman who changed career – and it carried 7 marks. The majority of candidates reported his age, at 39, correctly. Those candidates who had not heard this detail tended to guess wildly (e.g. 50), but some misheard the age as 29. The answer to the second detail was generally accurate, although 'international classic' was not allowed. Items 3, 4 and 5 posed few problems – item 4 being very well answered by most candidates as 'challenge' and 'tutor'/'teacher'. Football matches was easily understood, but 'futbol' and 'maches' were common misspellings. And the last detail was generally well-answered, exceptions being 'proud' instead of 'support'.

**Part 3**

**Question 9** concerned the benefits of sunlight to our health. Candidates scored well in general on this exercise.

**Question 10** focused on lantern makers in Taiwan, and was answered less well.



# ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

Paper 0510/04

Paper 4 Listening (Extended)

## General comments

Generally candidates responded well to the extended listening paper and the full range of marks was recorded by examiners. Scripts were mainly complete, with no serious omissions, demonstrating that candidates had coped well with the timing and format of the examination, as in previous sessions. Examiners allowed phonetic attempts at answers in accordance with the *listening for understanding* ethos of the component, except where the spelling altered the sense of the answer, for example, 'brake' for 'break'.

Examiners commented that the level of English teaching in centres in preparation for the examination is generally of a high standard - this was evident in many cases. Some groups of candidates, however, fared poorly and would have benefited from entry at core tier. Advice to centres is to only enter candidates working at a steady C and above for the extended paper – this can be ascertained by working through past papers along with published mark schemes.

The handwriting of some candidates was very hard for examiners to read, especially where papers had been completed in pencil. Presumably candidates intended to go over the writing in ink if time allowed. Candidates are asked to complete the paper using black ink and to cross out in order to make changes/corrections.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Part 1**

**Questions 1-6** formed Part 1 of the paper. This section comprised six short scenarios demanding concise answers. Generally candidates performed well, often achieving a good proportion of the eight available marks, thereby demonstrating a good level of aural comprehension and engagement with task/taped text.

**Question 1** asked for details of the special offer and needed the idea of 'free lesson(s)'. This was well attempted by all, although some candidates wrote 'three lessons' and could not be credited

**Question 2** required two details about the ticket price reduction and needed 'library card' and 'passport'. There were some unusual responses but most candidates scored both of the two available marks.

**Question 3** needed the idea of having to cross a busy road in order to reach the bank. Some candidates failed to recognise that Thandie needed to perform an action to resolve her difficulty – i.e. that she needed *to cross* the busy road, or *to use* the subway.

**Question 4** was well attempted and there were some good answers here. The lack of a coach, the fact that it was a local event and the time of 4pm were credited.

**Question 5** was again well answered. Although most candidates correctly responded with, 'it is not connected to the computer,' a few wrote, 'it does not connect to the computer,' which was not accurate.

**Question 6** Examiners credited 'the bargain at the new shop' or 'the buy one get one free deal'. Some candidates tried variations such as 'the other shop' which were too general. A few candidates explained both the bargains rather than distinguishing between them. More work on question words - Which? What? Who? - would be helpful in raising scores. Candidates should be wary of negating a correct answer by writing a lot of incorrect information after it, for example, 'the buy one get one free and the discount card.'

**Part 2** of the paper comprised two form-filling exercises and was well answered by many candidates who demonstrated a good level of aural comprehension.

**Question 7** with seven available marks was based on an interview with a rug maker. The first mark was well answered, 2 metres being required. Some candidates offered 'mm' for millimetres but most got the measurement accurately. The next answers required were tribe/family/maker and place. Candidates need to be aware that it might not be sufficient to place the words in the gaps in any order – they need to make sense in context. The quality of the wool was generally noted as soft, with the cheaper wool being rougher. These seemed accessible and were supplied in most cases. Both hand-made and machine-made were needed for the next mark – many candidates did not supply the second item correctly although examiners also gave credit for 'not handmade'. 'Plant dye' was required for colour production and was answered well. Pattern was commonly proposed for the last detail, but was offered in a variety of spellings – e.g. patton, patten, paton. Partner was a common error here.

**Question 8** was in response to an interview with Luigi Rigoletti – the salesman who changed career – and it carried nine marks. His age (39 years) was universally well answered and the international classical music charts was also generally accurate. He had been a salesman for 15 years until last year. His motivation was his need for a challenge and his singing teacher/tutor. Luigi won the festival event/competition, had combined careers as a salesman and evenings and weekends as a singer. The next response was that he sings at football matches followed by the fact that he is recording a CD with a national orchestra. Finally, his family offer him support and understanding. Many candidates responded with 'proud' but this did not make grammatical or contextual sense and could not be credited.

**Part 3** was the most challenging part of the paper and comprised two exercises requiring phrase or sentence length responses.

**Question 9** was about the benefits of sunlight to health. Item **(a)** was well answered (helps the body to function better) and **(b)** was generally well done. Three possible details were sunstroke/headache/skin cancer, which most candidates supplied accurately. Most candidates correctly named the production of vitamin D and the activation of hormones for **(c)** and achieved the mark. Item **(d)** needed the idea of strengthening teeth and bones and **(e)** required three details – for example – eat lunch outside/take your breaks outside/buy a light box.

**Question 10** was about the decline in reading and proved quite challenging for some candidates, although the exercise differentiated well. Item **(a)** required three details - the idea of there being many bookshops, many books sold and people reading everywhere. Item **(b)** needed the idea of comparing survey results across time and **(c)** required highlighting the problem and creating awareness of the decline in reading. Most candidates managed to answer **(d)**, the internet/not reading whole books were two possible answers. Item **(e)** required the idea that readers play an active part in society.

Some candidates fared well across the paper and demonstrated good engagement with the taped text throughout. For the less able candidates, further practice of exam technique, such as how to focus on the actual demands of the question, is required. Work on general vocabulary, especially homophones such as 'buy' and 'by' would also help towards raising achievement. Use of past papers and mark schemes, as always, will help candidates gain practice and understanding of the examination format and requirements of each exercise.



# ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

Paper 0510/05

Oral

## General comments

This session saw an increase in entries.

## Comments on specific aspects of the Oral Test

### **Part A – Welcome and brief explanation of the Test format**

Moderators still note that this is absent from a number of recordings. Even if the teacher/Examiner knows the candidates, please ensure that a summary of the format of the Test is provided **at the outset**. This should be done in a friendly manner, and can help to place candidates at ease.

### **Part B – the Warm Up**

Moderators noted improvement in this area, particularly in the number of Examiners who are using the warm up phase to elicit potential areas of interests. It is good practice to use the warm up to try and select an appropriate topic for a candidate to discuss further. If this is not attempted, Moderators note that, in some cases, quite inappropriate topics are given to candidates who struggle to maintain a dialogue.

Moderators prefer Examiners to avoid talking too much about school, and certainly to avoid mention of examinations, stress, nerves, etc. Please discuss general matters, or perhaps current topics pertinent to the region, in addition to teasing out candidates' hobbies and interests.

On the whole, Moderators would like the warm ups to be a little shorter – to remain within the 2-3 minutes specified. Long warm ups are almost always counter-productive.

Please note – the Examiner chooses the card, **not** the candidate.

### **Part C – handing out the Topic Card, and preparation time**

The tape should be paused after the warm up; after the Examiner has announced which topic card he/she has chosen for the candidate.

It is not necessary to read out word-for-word what is printed on the Card – a summary of the topic is fine. Candidates are allowed to ask questions during this stage while they study the Card – this **need not** be recorded.

The selection of Topic Cards should **not** be random. It is not fair to candidates to choose Cards in this manner (e.g. A, B, C, D, E – then a repeated pattern). Topics should be selected to try to match each candidate's interest and ability (from evidence in the warm up). Moderators are listening to see how, and how well, this is done by Examiners.

There is no need to use all of the Cards, and certainly no need to distribute topics/cards evenly. However, please do attempt to use a good range of topics.

### **Part D – the Conversation**

The aim of the Cards is to generate **focused discussion** on the topic/theme given. Many Examiners and candidates are achieving this, and Moderators report that they enjoy listening to fruitful discussions.

## 0510 English as a Second Language November 2006

A pleasing aspect was the development of responses. The best discussions were relaxed and allowed a natural conversation to flow, with Examiners picking up on points made by candidates, but returning to the topic at appropriate times to ensure focus. Some Examiners prefer to work through the bullet points – this is acceptable, but these Examiners should perhaps seek to extend the discussions beyond the prompts.

A few Examiners are reminded, however, that it is their responsibility to ensure that candidates do not offer speeches or monologues. This is still happening at too many Centres. In such cases, the Examiner should intervene quickly and begin a conversation.

Moderators would therefore like to hear discussion/conversation **from the outset** – there is no need for an introductory speech by the candidate about the topic.

For a conversation to occur, there needs to be input **from both parties**.

### The Topic Cards

Moderators report that all five Cards were within the experience of candidates and produced lively and interesting conversations.

Card A – Noise – worked well, moving from the personal/anecdotal through to the more difficult idea of solving a dispute between neighbours. Many Examiners were happy to move to more challenging areas, and were generally rewarded with stimulating discussion.

Card B – The changing workplace – occasionally deteriorated into a general conversation about the advances of technology without relating these to the workplace. Nonetheless, there were many personalised discussions based around the jobs of the family, and working at home. Stronger candidates were able to deal with the more advanced concepts suggested.

Card C – Telling lies – was very popular and generally well-handled by those it was given to. Candidates were comfortable with stories of lies that they had told and how lies are detected.

Card D – Working with animals – was successful, with a description initially of pets at home. All the prompts worked particularly well here to develop a focused discussion. There were some interesting and perceptive discussions with regard to differing attitudes to animals in different countries.

Card E – Shopping – was offered to both sexes and, pleasingly, worked well for both. Many Examiners, quite sensibly, gave this card to weaker candidates.

Examiners should note that the degree of difficulty increases with each prompt – this should be borne in mind with weaker candidates, who may struggle with the more difficult concepts proposed in the last two prompts. On the other hand, stronger candidates can be moved towards more abstract discussion earlier in the conversation. Examiners are therefore expected to differentiate. It is good examining to 'thin out' a topic for a weaker candidate, for example. Equally so, Examiners will need to ask more challenging questions of more able candidates.

Moderators are listening to hear how well candidates can develop the conversation/discussion.

### Assessment Criteria

Moderators still detect lenient marking. Adjustments were made to reflect this, particularly in lowering Band 1 marks into Band 2.

Leniency is more common in applying the Fluency and Structure criteria. Examiners need to be sure that a candidate has contributed to **the development** of the conversation before being awarded a 9 or a 10. Equally so, a candidate in Band 1 needs to illustrate a wide range of **accurate and spontaneous** structures to earn 9 or 10 marks for this criterion.

### Administrative procedures

Many Centres are clearly aware of the tasks and duties that need to be carried out by the external Moderators and the moderating team are very grateful to Examiners at these Centres.

However, there are several procedural matters needing attention:

- Moderators continue to have to complete an unacceptable number of Amendments. Mistakes in adding up and/or transcription will have been drawn to a Centre's attention in the Report – would these Centres please **nominate a person other than the Examiner** (e.g. a colleague in the English department) to check the totals which are being arrived at. It really is unacceptable to award a mark to a candidate after an examination, and then record a *different* mark on the official documentation.
- Some Centres are still failing to include **both** of the required forms. The Moderator's copy of the Mark Sheet (MS1) is important to confirm accurate transcription of the marks. The Summary Form is equally important, as this indicates the breakdown of the marks into the three criteria for all of the candidates.
- Regarding sampling, 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**. Please avoid sending in a large number of cassettes.

### Advice to large Centres

The use of more than one Examiner should be seen **only** at large Centres – i.e. those with a large number of candidates. From 2007, the syllabus defines a large Centre as having **more than 30 candidates**. It is assumed, therefore, that a single Examiner should be in a position to conduct up to 30 oral tests.

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, and that assessment is consistent among the Examiners.

It is suggested that Centres who need to use more than one Examiner, **appoint a single Examiner to act as the Internal Moderator** and to be responsible for overseeing the Oral Test examination session. Duties should include: planning the tests; drawing up a suitable testing timetable; ensuring that each Examiner has a good number of candidates to examine (at least 30); monitoring the examining team to maintain consistency throughout the session; and organising and collating the documentation which is sent in to CIE.

# ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

---

Paper 0510/06  
Speaking (Coursework)

## General comments

In the ideal portfolio of coursework a candidate complete three **different** tasks. It is suggested that candidates take part in a group discussion, some pair-work, and make an individual presentation. Evident of these should be presented on the Individual Candidate Record Cards, which should contain full descriptions of the tasks undertaken.

It was clear again that Centres who comply with the above requirements make a very good job of designing, conducting and assessing coursework tasks. At these Centres, candidates clearly enjoyed being involved in coursework activities.

However, the remaining Centres conducted rather limited and occasionally inappropriate coursework. The external Moderators urge these Centres to think again about how they opt for the coursework component. The aim of coursework is to broaden a candidate's learning experience, not to limit it, and to give a candidate more scope for conveying his or her oral skills than in a single, more format Test.

If a teacher is not completely confident in designing and implementing three different and productive tasks then it is advisable to opt for Paper 5, the Oral Test.

## **Assessment**

This session saw a tendency towards lenient marking.

## **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 has been completed.

For the moderation process to be completed efficiently, Centres should submit **only** a recording of candidates *engaged in a discussion or conversation*. This might be with a teacher/Examiner or it might be with another candidate.

Centres are reminded that **there is no need** to record activities which will not feature in the sample sent in. It would be far too cumbersome to have to record all coursework activities, and it would negate the aim of assessing candidates in a more relaxed and creative/expressive atmosphere.